
#### Appendix N3

### Public Meeting #3 Summary Report


Part 4 of 4



# HOW DO THE ALTERNATIVES COMPARE TO EACH OTHER?

# ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING PROCESS

#### **Alternatives Evaluation Process**



Level 1: Presented in November 2009 to the Peer Technical Review Committee, Community Advisory Committee, and the Public Scoping Meeting

Level 2 & Level 3: Presented on March 25th to the Peer Technical Review Committee, on April 7th to the Community Advisory Committee, and at Tonight's Meeting

#### **Detailed Alternative Screening Process** Continuing Public & Agency Involvement Level 1 Level 2 Level 3 Eliminate with Eliminate with Eliminate with Explanation Explanation Explanation Recommended Yes Others Alternatives Reasonable Compare Multi-Modal Carried Alternatives to No Preliminary Forward into be carried Alternatives Level 2 forward for Screening detailed analysis in the Draft EIS Meets Greater Meets Less than 50% of than 50% of **Future Travel** Future Travel We Are Demand Demand Advance as Advance as Primary Other Transportation Alternatives and Complementary Mode Alternatives **Flements** Develop Multi-Modal Alternatives

ALAMO RMA

# ALTERNATIVES SCREENING PROCESS

#### **Level 1: Fatal Flaw Analysis (Qualitative)**

- Evaluate Alternatives for Fatal Flaws:
  - Mode not compatible with regional plans
  - Unproven technology
  - Major adverse impacts

#### Level 2: Detailed Modal Analysis (Quantitative)

- Evaluation based on quantitative measures may include:
  - Capacity and demand
  - Safety improvement
  - Travel time improvement
  - Engineering feasibility
- Alternatives grouped as primary and complementary transportation modes

#### Level 3: Detailed Multi-Modal Analysis (Quantitative)

- Combine primary and complementary transportation modes to form comprehensive solutions
- Detailed evaluation/comparison of multimodal alternatives using additional criteria such as:
  - Right-of-way requirements
  - Relocation and displacements
  - Cost effectiveness
  - Environmental considerations
- Recommendation of a set of reasonable alternatives for evaluation in the Draft EIS

All Reasonable Draft EIS Expressway
Improvement Alternatives will be analyzed for
both Non-Toll and Toll effects



#### **Alternatives Evaluation Criteria**

- Based on fatal flaws:
  - Mode not compatible with regional plans
  - Unproven technology
  - Major adverse impacts

#### Alternatives Carried Forward into Level 2 Evaluation

- No Build Retained as a baseline for comparison in the Draft EIS
- Transit Alternatives
  - Light Rail
  - Streetcars
  - Fixed Route Bus
  - Express Bus Service
  - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Highway Improvement Alternatives
  - Add lanes to existing US 281 (no overpasses)
  - Grade separated intersections
  - Widen Blanco Road and Bulverde Road
  - Upgrade existing US 281 to an Expressway
  - High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) / High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes
- Other Alternatives
  - Growth Management
  - Bike and Pedestrian Facilities
  - Transportation System Management (TSM)
  - Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

#### Alternatives Considered and Eliminated

- Heavy Rail
  - Not compatible with regional plans
- Commuter Rail
  - Not compatible with regional plans
- Automated Guideway Transit
  - Speed and service distance not satisfactory
  - Not compatible with regional plans
- Personal Rapid Transit
  - Not a proven technology
  - Not compatible with regional plans
- New Parallel Corridor
  - High adverse impacts



#### **Alternatives Evaluation Criteria**

- Based on the ability to:
  - Reduce conflict between local and through traffic
  - Improve system connectivity
  - Reduce crash rates

#### Alternatives Carried Forward into Level 3 Evaluation

- No Build Retained as a baseline for comparison in the Draft EIS
- Primary Alternatives Satisfy at least 50% of forecasted travel demand
  - Upgrade US 281 to an Expressway
- Other Alternatives Not eliminated but do not satisfy 50% of forecasted travel demand
  - Add lanes to existing US 281 (no overpasses)
  - Grade separated intersections
  - Widen Blanco Road and Bulverde Road

#### **Complementary Elements** - To be considered as part of all Build Alternatives

- Bus & Park-and-Ride Facilities
- Bike & Pedestrian Facilities
- Growth Management
- Transportation System Management
- Transportation Demand Management

#### **Alternatives Considered and Eliminated**

- Light Rail and Streetcar
  - No existing system for connectivity south of Loop 1604
  - High cost to connect to possible future light rail/streetcar system south of Loop 1604
  - Relatively low existing and forecasted (2035) population and employment density north of Loop 1604
  - VIA Coordination
    - Build Alternatives to maintain opportunity for future addition of high-capacity transit
    - One or more Park-and-Ride locations with Bus service to be included in Build Alternatives



#### LEVEL 3 DETAILED MULTI-MODAL ANALYSIS

#### Level 3 - Build Alternatives

Overpass/Expansion (Non-To	oll)	Complementary Elements
Overpass/Expansion + Wide Bulverde Road (Non-Toll)	<ul> <li>Bus, Park-and-Ride Facilities</li> <li>Bike and Pedestrian Facilities</li> <li>Growth Management*</li> </ul>	
Expressway	Non-Toll	Encourage Higher Density Inside Loop 1604     Promote Infill Development Inside Loop 1604
	Toll	Support Mixed Use Development Inside Loop     1604
	Managed	<ul> <li>Transportation System Management*</li> <li>Park-and-ride lots</li> </ul>
	Non-Toll	<ul> <li>Intersection Improvements</li> <li>Transportation Demand Management*</li> </ul>
Elevated Expressway	Toll	Flexible Work Hours     Carpooling/Vanpooling     Telecommuting
	Managed	* As adopted in Mobility 2035, SA-BC MPO

#### Level 3 - Alternatives: Lane Diagrams

NO BU (Includes Super Street LOOP 1604/US 281 Connec	Improvements and Southern Direct			<b>ee</b>	
OVERPASS/E (Non-	Toll)		<b>G G</b>	<b>666</b>	
OVERPASS/EX WIDEN BLAN BULVERDE ROA (Access solutions	CO ROAD & AD (Non-Toll)	BLANCO (1604 - BORGFELD) LISTED AS 2 OR 4 LANES IN MTP	<b>6 6</b>	<b>666</b>	BUL VERDE (EVANS - US 281) LISTED AS 2 OR 4 LANES IN MTP
	NON-TOLL	FFF	<b>G G</b>	<b>G G</b>	FFF
EXPRESSWAY	TOLL	FFF	<u>^</u>	命命命	fff
	MANAGED	FFF	<b>₩</b> ₩	<b>m m m</b>	fff
ELEVATED EXPRESSWAY	NON-TOLL	G G BRIDGE	E E E	<b>a a a</b>	G G BRIDGE
(Access solutions are required)  Note: The elevated lanes would be located outside of the existing US	TOLL	BRIDGE		<b>1 1 1 1</b>	BRIDGE
281 lanes from Loop 1604 to Stone Oak Parkway. North of Stone Oak Parkway, the elevated lanes would transition to the west side of existing US 281 and remain on the west side to Borgfeld Road.	MANAGED	BRIDGE	F.E.E	TT TE	BRIOGE
<b>↑</b> Blanco/Bulverd	e Rd 😰 📵	Existing Lan	e	Fron	tage Road La
				_	



#### HOW ARE MANAGED LANES DIFFERENT FROM TOLL LANES?

- •Toll Lanes Lanes on which vehicles, not exempted by state law, must pay to use
- Managed Lanes An operational approach to managing lanes. Lanes can be free or have tolls based on certain conditions such as:
  - -Number of persons per automobile
    - single occupant vehicles
    - •multi occupant vehicles
  - -Vehicle type
    - Bus
    - Emergency vehicle
    - Motorcycle
    - Automobile
    - Larger trucks
  - -Time of day and week
- -Combination of any of the above



Katy Tollway – Houston, Texas

# WOULD REVERSIBLE LANES WORK ON US 281?

 A Reversible Lane is a lane on which the direction of traffic can change to accommodate traffic during peak times.




- For example in the morning a reversible lane on US 281 might flow towards San Antonio, but towards Comal County in the afternoon.
- On US 281 the directional split is the distribution of traffic flows northbound versus southbound.
- Highways with more than 60% of vehicles going in the same direction during a peak period are good candidates for reversible lanes.
- On US 281, the directional split during peak hours was recorded to be:

	Northbound (Inbound)	Southbound (Outbound)	Reversible Candidate
AM Peak (7 to 9 am)	64% to 74%	26% to 36%	Yes
PM Peak (4 to 6 pm)	42% to 48%	52% to 58%	No

Source: US 281 EIS Team (February 2010)

 The AM peak may support reversible lanes, but the traffic during the PM peak is more balanced. Therefore, reversible lanes were not considered further for US 281.



Source: US 281 EIS Team (February 2010)




#### Is the alternative compatible with the MPO Plan?



Alternative	Yes	No
No Build		×
Overpass/Expansion		×
Overpass/Expansion + Widen of Blanco Rd and Bulverde Rd		×
Expressway (Non Toll)		×
Expressway (Toll)	<b>√</b>	
Expressway (Managed)		×
Elevated Expressway (Non Toll)		×
Elevated Expressway (Toll)	<b>√</b>	
Elevated Expressway (Managed)		×

Note: If a build alternative is selected, the MPO Plan and the Build Alternative must be consistent for a Record of Decision to be issued.

#### Is the alternative compatible w/ Camp Bullis operations?





	Alternative	Yes	Somewhat	No
ı	No Build	✓		
ı	Overpass/Expansion	<b>✓</b>		
	Overpass/Expansion + Widen Blanco Rd and Bulverde Rd			×
	Expressway		<b>✓</b>	
ı	Elevated Expressway		✓	

#### Will it be easy to provide for high capacity transit in the

future?





Alternative	Yes	No
No Build		×
Overpass/Expansion		×
Overpass/Expansion + Widen Blanco Rd and Bulverde Rd		×
Expressway	✓	
Elevated Expressway	✓	

#### What could happen to the Super Street?



Super Street at Stone Oak Pkwy – San Antonio, TX



Alternative	Retained	Partially Retained	Eliminated
No Build	✓		
Overpass/Expansion			×
Overpass/Expansion + Widen Blanco Rd and Bulverde Rd			×
Expressway			*
Elevated Expressway		✓	


#### How much additional right of way could be required?



US 281 and Evans Road – San Antonio, TX


\*Additional Right of Way may be required for access solutions

Source: US 281 EIS Team







#### How much additional impervious cover could there be if



#### How many driveways and side streets could lose access?




#### How many homes and businesses could be displaced?





#### How much additional right of way could be within the **Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone?**



How much additional right of way could be within sensitive


#### karst zones?



Source: Texas Commission on Environmental Quality and US 281 FIS Team

\*Additional Right of Way may be required for access solutions

Source: US Fish and Wildlife Service and US 281 EIS Team



Overpass/Expansion & Widen Blanco & Bulverde


#### How many additional wooded acres could be in the Right of Way? Right of Way is Preliminary and Subject to Change



US 281 - San Antonio, Texas

\* Additional Right of Way may be required for access solutions

Source: US 281 EIS Team





#### How many vehicles/day could be on US 281 in 2035?




What could be the average vehicle speed on US 281 in





Source: MPO Travel Demand Model and US 281 EIS Team




#### How many crashes in the region could be reduced in 2035?



Note: The MPO Region includes: Bexar County

Source: MPO Travel Demand Model and US 281 EIS Team





# POPULATION AND AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC (ADT)

#### Population growth along US 281

2000 population (Source: US Census Bureau)
 Estimated 2008 population 86,505
 Percent Growth (2000 – 2008) ~ 107%
 Projected 2035 population 142,240
 Percent Growth (2008 – 2035) ~ 64% (Source: MPO Demographic Forecasts)

#### Increase in population leads to increased traffic

2010 ADT 90,000 vehicles (South of Encino Rio, Source: Feb 2010 Traffic Counts, US 281 EIS Team)
 2035 ADT (No-Build Alternative) 115,000 vehicles
 2035 ADT (Build Alternatives) 160,000 to 210,000 vehicles (North of Sonterra Road, Source: MPO Travel Demand Model and US 281 EIS

#### Increased traffic levels lead to reduced speeds and more congestion during peak hours\*

2008 peak hour speed ~ 25 mph
 2035 peak hour speed ~ 5 mph
 (No-Build Alternative)
 2035 peak hour speed ~ 20 - 45 mph
 (Build Alternatives)



<sup>\*</sup> Lower speeds would generally occur in the southern area near Loop 1604 due to higher traffic volumes. Higher speeds would occur in the northern area near Borgfeld Road due to lower traffic volumes

#### LEVEL 3 ALTERNATIVES AND EVALUATION SUMMARY

#### Level 3 - Alternatives Evaluation Criteria and Results\*

				Alternatives 2035								
ference #	<u>Level 3 Criteria</u>	Metrics		No Build	Overpass/	Overpass/Expansion & Widen	Expressway			Ele	vated Express	way
				NO Build	Expansion	Blanco Rd. and Bulverde Rd.	Non Toll	Toll	Managed	Non Toll	Toll	Manage
	Regional Goals, Policies & Other Items											
1	Compatibility with Regional Plans	2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan	N/A	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
2		VIA Comprehensive Plan	N/A	TBD	TBD	TBD		TBD			TBD	
3	Camp Bullis mission	Potential to avoid adverse effects	N/A	Yes	Yes	No		Somewhat			Somewhat	
4	Future Mainline Capacity Expansion	Ease of expansion in the future	N/A	Somewhat	No	No		Yes			Yes	
5	Future High Capacity Transit Potential (Light Rail/Street Car)	Ease of implementation in the future	N/A	No	No	No		Yes			Yes	
6	Superstreet Preservation	Eliminated or Retained	N/A	Retained		Eliminated		Eliminated			Partially retaine	d
	Measures of Effectiveness - Daily (corridor / regional) (2008 and 2035 for No Build		0.5			00		- 10				
7	Average Peak Hour Speed (mph) - Corridor	U.S. 281 Corridor - All Lane Types	25	5	20	20 20		40			30 45	
_	101 0 101 11 1	U.S. 281 Corridor - Mainlanes only	25 40	5	20	105	400	45	400	405		445
		South of Bulverde - U.S. 281 Corridor		75	120		130	120	120	125	115	115
	Average Daily Traffic (000s)	South of Bulverde - Blanco + Bulverde	20	45	30	40	20	25	25	20	25	25
		North of Sonterra - U.S. 281 Corridor	90	115	170	165	210	185	180	170	160	160
_		North of Sonterra - Blanco + Bulverde	40	110	90	100	70	85	85	90	95	95
		LOS A, B, C, or D	10%	5%	20%	35%		70%			60%	
	LOS along U.S. 281 Corridor - Percent of Centerline miles	LOSE	0%	0%	20%	5%		15%			10%	
		LOS F	90%	95%	60%	60%		15%			30%	
		LOS A, B, C, or D	65%	5%	5%	45%		50%			30%	
)	LOS along Parallel Facilities (Bulverde and Blanco) - Percent of Centerline miles	LOS E	10%	0%	55%	5%		10%			25%	
		LOS F	25%	95%	40%	50%		40%			45%	_
1	Daily Miles of Travel - Regional	Change in Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) compared to 2035 No Build- (000s)	N/A	0	40	-40	-140	-110	-200	-110	-90	-160
	Daily Hours of Travel - Regional	Change in Vehicle Hours of Travel (VHT) compared to 2035 No Build- (000s)	N/A	0	-80	-90	-100	-100	-130	-80	-80	-110
	Safety & Functionality											
3	Crash Reduction as compared to No Build - Regional (2035)	Annual Reduction in crashes (region)	N/A	0	100-150	100 - 150	300 - 350	250 - 300	300 - 350	200 - 250	150 - 200	200 - 25
	Exposure to existing conflict points (# of driveways along roadway type) - U.S. 281	Frontage Roads	0	0	9	9		142			0	
į.	Corridor	Principal Arterial	142	142	32	32		0			122	
	Conidor	Ramps	0	0	101	101		0			20	
5	Approximate number of driveways and side streets that would potentially need to	Side Streets	0	0	12	12		0			2	
,	be removed or realigned	Driveways	0	0	114	114		0			33	
	Future Conflict Potential - U.S. 281 Corridor	Potential for future addition of conflict points (driveways/intersections) along mainlanes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
	Environment	mamanes	Existing ROW			Existing ROW						
	(This data results from a preliminary desktop analysis, the environmental field su	rveys will be completed during the preparation of the Draft EIS.)	(U.S. 281)			(U.S. 281, Blanco Rd. & Bulverde Rd.)						
	Right-of-Way (ROW)	# of acres of additional ROW required	0	0	27	97 0		124			95	
											413	
		# of total acres of ROW (existing ROW + proposed ROW)	318	318	345	573 476		442				
_		# of acres within Karst Zone 1	164	318 164	345 180	573 476 292 235		229			219	
,	Karst Zones	# of acres within Karst Zone 1 # of acres within Karst Zone 2	164 106	318 164 106	345 180 110	573 476 292 235 154 135		229 128			219 122	
1		# of acres within Karst Zone 1 # of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet)	164 106 575	318 164 106 575	345 180 110 575	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575		229 128 575			219 122 575	
3	Karst Zones	# of acres within Karst Zone 1 # of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) # of acres within Recharge Zone	164 106 575 268	318 164 106 575 268	345 180 110 575 287	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 446 372		229 128 575 353			219 122 575 338	
	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone	# of acres within Karst Zone 1 # of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) # of acres within Recharge Zone # of potential residential displacements	164 106 575	318 164 106 575	345 180 110 575 287 0	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 446 372 34 0		229 128 575 353 3			219 122 575 338 2	
	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat	# of acres within Karst Zone 1 # of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) # of acres within Recharge Zone # of protential residential displacements # of potential commercial building displacements	164 106 575 268 0	318 164 106 575 268	345 180 110 575 287	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 446 372 34 0		229 128 575 353 3 28			219 122 575 338 2 23	
3 9 0 1	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties	if of acres within Karst Zone 1 if of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) if of acres within Recharge Zone if of potential ornmercial building displacements if of potential commercial building displacements if of properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (within 150-flor ROW)	164 106 575 268 0 0	318 164 106 575 268 0 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12	573 476 2992 235 154 135 575 575 446 372 34 0 13 0		229 128 575 353 3 28 0			219 122 575 338 2 23	
3	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources	# of acces within Karst Zone 1 # of acces within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) # of acces within Recharge Zone # of potential residential displacements # of potential residential displacements # of properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (within 150-for ROW)  # of access with an elevated potential for archeological resources	164 106 575 268 0 0	318 164 106 575 268 0 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 446 372 34 0 0 0 0 0		229 128 575 353 3 28 0			219 122 575 338 2 23 0	
3 9 0 1 2 3	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildlife Habitat	if of acres within Karst Zone 1 if of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) if of acres within Recharge Zone if of potential commercial building displacements if of potential commercial building in the potential of the potential commercial building in the potential of	164 106 575 268 0 0 0	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0	673 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 446 372 34 0 13 0 0 0 182 142 50 17		229 128 575 353 3 28 0 148 42			219 122 575 338 2 23 0 137 38	
1	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources	# of acres within Karst Zone 1 # of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) # of acres within Recharge Zone # of potential residential displacements # of potential residential displacements # of properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (within 150-for ROW) # of acres with an elevated potential for archeological resources # of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW # of known hazdrodus material sites	164 106 575 268 0 0	318 164 106 575 268 0 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 446 372 34 0 0 0 0 0		229 128 575 353 3 28 0			219 122 575 338 2 23 0	
8 9 0 1 2 3 4	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildlife Habitat	# of acces within Karst Zone 1 # of acces within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) # of acces within Recharge Zone # of potential residential displacements # of potential residential displacements # of properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (within 150-for ROW)  # of acces with an elevated potential for archeological resources # of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW # of known hazardous material silendous (VOC) estimated along U.S. 281 Cornidor compared to 2035 No Build (tons)	164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0 105 22 0	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 576 372 448 372 34 0 13 0 0 182 142 50 17 0 0 -52 0	-67	229 128 575 353 3 28 0 148 42 0	-81	-57	219 122 575 338 2 23 0 137 38 0	-58
3 9 0 1 2 3 1 5	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Rechange Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildlife Habitat Hazardous Matharials	if of acres within Karst Zone 1 if of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) if of acres within Recharge Zone if of potential commercial building displacements if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing compounds (VOC) estimated along U.S. 281 Corridor compared to 2035 No Build (tons) if of stream crossings	164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0 105 22 0	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 575 577 34 0 13 0 0 0 182 142 50 17 0 0 -52 0 17	-67	229 128 575 353 3 28 0 148 42 0	-81	-57	219 122 575 338 2 23 0 137 38 0 -65	-58
33 4 5 5 3 3 7	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildlife Habitat Hazardous Materials Air Quality Streams	# of acces within Karst Zone 1 # of acces within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) # of acces within Recharge Zone # of potential residential displacements # of potential residential displacements # of properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (within 150-fol ROW) # of acces with an elevated potential for archeological resources # of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW # of known hazardous material size of properties (Change in annual volatile organic compounds (VOC) estimated along U.S. 281 Cornidor compared to 2035 No Build (tons) # of stream crossings # of linear feet	164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 N/A 8 6,072	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0 105 22 0 -45 8 6,495	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 576 446 372 34 0 13 0 0 182 142 50 17 0 0 -52 0 17 17 17 9,260 7,793	-67	229 128 575 353 3 28 0 148 42 0 -81 8 7,207	-81	-57	219 122 575 338 2 23 0 137 38 0 -65 8	-58
	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildliffe Habitat Hazardous Materials Air Quality Streams Traffic Noise (based on 2009 Aerials)	if of acres within Karst Zone 1 if of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) if of acres within Recharge Zone if of potential commercial building displacements if of potential research if of potential research if of rown with a netwated potential for archeological resources if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing compounds (VOC) estimated along U.S. 281 Corridor compared to 2035 No Build (tons) if of stream crossings if of linear feet if of noise receivers within 500 feet of ROW (Category B)	164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 N/A 8 6,072	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 0 8 6,072	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0 105 22 0 -45 8 6,495 189	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 575 575 34 0 13 0 0 0 182 142 50 17 0 0 17 17 17 9,260 7,793 976 875	-67	229 128 575 353 3 28 0 148 42 0 -81 8 7,207 247	-81	-57	219 122 575 338 2 23 0 137 38 0 -65 8 6,652 226	-58
1	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Rechange Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildlife Habitat Hazardous Materials Air Quality Streams Traffic Noise (based on 2009 Aerials) Floodplains	if of acres within Karst Zone 1 if of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) if of acres within Recharge Zone if of acres within Recharge Zone if of potential commercial building displacements if of rown in the commercial building displacements if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded ac	164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 NI/A 8 6,072 182	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 0 8 6,072 182 21	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0 105 22 0 -45 8 6,495 189 23	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 576 377 448 372 34 0 13 0 0 182 142 50 17 0 0 -52 0 17 17 17 976 875 59 43	-67	229 128 575 353 3 28 0 148 42 0 -81 8 7,207 247	-81	-57	219 122 575 338 2 23 0 137 38 0 -65 8	-58
8 9 9 00 1:1 1 22 1:3 1:4 1:5 5 1:6 6 1:7 1:8 8 9 9	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildliffe Habitat Hazardous Materials Air Quality Streams Traffic Noise (based on 2009 Aerials)	if of acres within Karst Zone 1 if of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) if of acres within Recharge Zone if of potential commercial building displacements if of potential research if of potential research if of rown with a netwated potential for archeological resources if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing compounds (VOC) estimated along U.S. 281 Corridor compared to 2035 No Build (tons) if of stream crossings if of linear feet if of noise receivers within 500 feet of ROW (Category B)	164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 N/A 8 6,072	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 0 8 6,072	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0 105 22 0 -45 8 6,495 189	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 575 575 34 0 13 0 0 0 182 142 50 17 0 0 17 17 17 9,260 7,793 976 875	-67	229 128 575 353 3 28 0 148 42 0 -81 8 7,207 247	-81	-57	219 122 575 338 2 33 0 137 38 0 -65 8 6,652 226	-58
88 99 00 11 22 23 33 44 55 66 77 88 99 00	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Rechange Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildlife Habitat Hazardous Materials Air Quality Streams Traffic Noise (based on 2009 Aerials) Floodplains	if of acres within Karst Zone 1 if of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) if of acres within Recharge Zone if of potential commercial building displacements if of rownward commercial building and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooden acres within existing compounds (VCC) estimated along U.S. 281 Cornidor compared to 2035 No Build (tons) if of stream crossings if of insear feet if of noise receivers within 500 feet of ROW (Category B) if of acres within the 100-year floodplain if a didditional acres of impervious cover	164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 N/A 8 6,072 182 21	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 0 8 6,072 182 21 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0 105 22 0 -45 8 6,495 189 23	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 575 446 372 34 0 13 0 0 0 182 142 50 17 0 0 -52 0 17 17 9,260 7,793 976 875 59 43 87	-67	229 128 575 555 353 3 28 0 148 42 0 -81 8 7,207 247 21 119	-81	-57	219 122 575 338 2 23 0 137 38 0 -65 8 6,652 226 21 5	-58
17 18 19 19 20 21 22 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	Karst Zones Karst Invertebrate Critical Habitat Edward's Aquifer Recharge Zone Displacements (based on 2009 Aerials) Historic Properties Archaeological Resources Wildlife Habitat Hazardous Materials Air Quality Streams Traffic Noise (based on 2009 Aerials) Floodplains Impervious Cover	if of acres within Karst Zone 1 if of acres within Karst Zone 2 Proximity to Critical Habitat Units (feet) if of acres within Recharge Zone if of potential commercial building displacements if of rownward commercial building and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooded acres within existing and proposed ROW if of wooden acres within existing compounds (VCC) estimated along U.S. 281 Cornidor compared to 2035 No Build (tons) if of stream crossings if of insear feet if of noise receivers within 500 feet of ROW (Category B) if of acres within the 100-year floodplain if a didditional acres of impervious cover	164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 N/A 8 6,072 182 21	318 164 106 575 268 0 0 0 94 15 0 0 8 6,072 182 21 0	345 180 110 575 287 0 12 0 105 22 0 -45 8 6,495 189 23	573 476 292 235 154 135 575 575 575 446 372 34 0 13 0 0 0 182 142 50 17 0 0 -52 0 17 17 9,260 7,793 976 875 59 43 87	-67 TBD	229 128 575 553 3 28 0 148 42 0 -81 8 7,207 247 21 119	-81 TBD	-57 TBD	219 122 575 338 2 23 0 137 38 0 -65 8 6,652 226 21 5	-58 TBD

Note: This overview assessment was prepared for the purpose of screening the alternatives. The information presented in this table is preliminary and subject to change based on field surveys and additional engineering during preparation of the Draft EIS. Potential impacts resulting from solutions to access issues involving side-streets and driveways have not been included in the data above. Solutions to these access issues could include frontage roads, "backage" roads, the purchase of access rights and/or any combination of these.

Level 3 - Recommendation Summary\*

			Alternatives		_	No Build	Overpass/ Expansion	Overpass/Expansion and	Non-Toll	xpresswa Toll	y Managed		xpressway				
		Advanc	ce into DEIS or Elin	nina	te	Advance	Advance	Widen Blanco Road and Eliminate		Advance			Advance				
_	Provide for	San Antonio-Be			etropolitan Planning Organization's 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan [1]	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No Y	es No				
and		and regional plans and policies		VIA Comprehensive Plan [2]		TBD	TBD	TBD		TBD		TE	3D				
Se :	Transportation Needs of Existing				Camp Bullis Mission [3]	Yes	Yes	No	S	omewha	at	Some	what				
Need & Purpose	Growth and Planned Future Growth	Satisfy Future Tra	vel Demand		ivel Demand		Average speed on U.S 281 [7] Level of Service (LOS) [9] Average Daily Traffic (ADT) [8]	No	Somewhat	Somewhat		Yes		Y	es		
		Develop facilities for multi-modal transportation			Pedestrian, Bike, Transit, & HOV/HOT	No	Somewhat	Somewhat		Yes		Yes					
		Allow for future high capacity transit			Ease of future implementation [5]	No	No	No	Yes		Yes						
ž ~.	Improve	Reduce travel time and increase travel speeds  Reduce conflicts between local and through traffic			Average speed on U.S. 281 [7]	No	Somewhat	Somewhat		Yes		Yes					
eet /es?	Functionality (Mobility and Accessibility)			1	# of conflict points [14]	No	Somewhat	Somewhat	Yes		Yes						
re Be Able To Meet Project Objectives?		Improve access to adjacent property			# driveways and side-streets potentially closed/realigned [15]	No	No	No	Yes			Somewhat					
le l	v 00.00	Reduce cras	Reduce crash rates		educe crash rates		Reduce crash rates		Regional crash reduction [13]	No	Somewhat	Somewhat		Yes		Y	es
e Ab	Improve Safety	Reduce number of high	Reduce number of high crashes locations		Exposure to existing conflict points on US 281 Corridor	No	Somewhat	Somewhat		Yes		Y	es				
Alternative Be Able To Meet Project Objectives?		Avoid or minimize adverse soc	cial and economic impacts	Base	Potential displacements [21] Level of Service F (LOS F) [9] Average speed on U.S 281 [7]	No	Somewhat	No	S	omewha	at	Some	what				
rna		Avoid or minimize adverse	water quality impacts		ize adverse water quality impacts		Avoid or minimize adverse water quality impacts		Ability to improve storm water management	No	Yes	Yes		Yes		Y	es
lte		Enhance air	quality		Estimated change in air quality [26]	No	Somewhat	Somewhat		Yes		Y	es				
e A	Enhance Quality	Minimize/avoid impacts	s to wildlife habitat		Wooded acres within the right-of-way [24]	Yes	Somewhat	Somewhat	S	omewha	at	Some	what				
The	of Life	Minimize noise	e impacts	1	Ability to provide noise mitigation	No	Somewhat	Somewhat	S	omewha	at	Some	what				
plu		Maximize use of no	on-toll funding		Potential amount of public funding	N/A	TBD	TBD		TBD		TE	3D				
Mould		Provide facilities for w	valking and biking		Incorporation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities	No	Yes	Yes		Yes		Y	es				
		Provide for aesthetics & landscaping			Application of Context Sensitive Solutions	No	Yes	Yes		Yes		Y	es				

Note: The [#] references the Draft Level 3 Evaluation Results. This overview assessment was prepared for the purpose of screening the alternatives. The information presented in this table is preliminary and subject to change based on field surveys and additional engineering during preparation of the Draft EIS. Potential impacts resulting from solutions to access issues involving side-streets and driveways have not been included in the data above. Solutions to these access issues could include frontage roads, "backage" roads, the purchase of access rights and/or any combination of these.



# ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPMENT AND SCREENING PROCESS RESULTS

#### Level 1

#### **Fatal Flaw Analysis**

No Build

Light Rail

Streetcars

Add Lanes to Existing US 281 (no overpasses)

Grade Separated Intersections

Widen Blanco Rd. and Bulverde Rd.

Upgrade US 281 to an Expressway

Fixed Route Bus

**Express Bus** 

**Bus Rapid Transit** 

Growth Management

Bike/Pedestrian Facilities

Transportation System Management

Transportation Demand Management

#### Considered & Eliminated

Heavy Rail

Commuter Rail

Monorail

Automated Guideway Transit

Personal Rapid Transit

New Parallel Corridor

#### Level 2

#### Detailed Modal Analysis

No Build

Add Lanes to Existing US 281 (no overpasses)

Grade Separated Intersections

Widen Blanco Rd. and Bulverde Rd.

Upgrade US 281 to an Expressway

Bus (Fixed Route Bus, Express Bus, Bus Rapid Transit)

Growth Management

Bike/Pedestrian Facilities

Transportation System Management

Transportation Demand Management

Considered &

**Eliminated** 

Light Rail

Streetcars

#### Level 3

#### Detailed Multi-Modal Analysis

No Build

Overpass/ Expansion (Grade Separated Intersections + Add Lanes)

•Non-Toll

Expressway

- •Non-Toll
- •Toll
- Managed

Elevated Expressway

- •Non-Toll
- •Toll
- Managed

#### Considered & Eliminated

Grade Separated Intersections + Add Lanes + Widen Blanco Rd. and Bulverde Rd.

#### Complementary Elements

(To be considered in all Reasonable Alternatives)

Bus, Park-and-Ride Facilities

Growth Management

Bike/Pedestrian Facilities

Transportation

System Management

Transportation Demand Management

#### Carried Forward into Draft EIS

#### Recommended Reasonable Alternatives

No Build

Overpass/ Expansion

• Non-Toll

Expressway

- •Non-Toll
- •Toll
- Managed

Elevated Expressway

- Non-Toll
- •Toll
- Managed

#### Complementary Elements

(To be considered in all Reasonable Alternatives)

Bus, Park-and-Ride Facilities

Growth Management

Bike/Pedestrian Facilities

Transportation System Management

Transportation Demand Management




## LEVEL 3 ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDED FOR ELIMINATION


# Further Widening of Blanco Road and Bulverde Road


- Impact to Camp Bullis Operations
- High amount of additional Right Of Way Required
- Large Number of Potential Displacements
- High Potential for Adverse Environmental Impacts



US 281
Blanco Road
Bulverde Road







#### RECOMMENDED REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO BE CARRIED FORWARD INTO DRAFT EIS

- No Build
  - US 281 Super Street Improvements
  - Loop 1604/US 281 Southern Direct Connectors
  - Routine Maintenance
  - All Other Improvements/Strategies in Long Range
     Transportation Plan Except US 281 north of Loop 1604
- Overpass / Expansion Alternative
  - Non-Toll
- Expressway Alternative
  - Non-Toll
  - Toll
  - Managed
- Elevated Expressway Alternative
  - Non-Toll
  - Toll
  - Managed

#### **Complementary Elements of All Build Alternatives**

- Bus, Park-and-Ride Facilities
- Bike & Pedestrian Facilities
- Growth Management
- Transportation System Management
- Transportation Demand Management

#### RECOMMENDED REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES TO BE CARRIED FORWARD INTO DRAFT EIS

#### Alternative 1: Overpass / Expansion (Non-Toll)

Preliminary and Subject to Change



US 281 and Evans Rd



US 281 and Marshall Rd

#### Alternative 2: Expressway (Non-Toll, Toll, Managed)

Preliminary and Subject to Change



US 281 and Evans Rd



US 281 and Marshall Rd

#### Alternative 3: Elevated Expressway (Non-Toll, Toll, Managed) Preliminary and Subject to Change



US 281 and Evans Rd



US 281 and Marshall Rd



# WHAT'S NEXT?


#### What's Next?

- Upcoming -Public InvolvementActivities
- Peer Technical Review
   Committee Meetings
- Community Advisory
   Committee Meetings
- Presentations to Homeowners
   Associations and Other
   Community Organizations
   (upon request)
- Public Hearing on Draft EIS (June 2011\*)
- Public Meeting on Preferred Alternative (September 2011\*)
- Newsletters
- Website Updates to <u>www.411on281.com/US281EIS</u>

\* Approximate Dates



#### ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PROCESS



\* Approximate Dates



# FACTORS BEING CONSIDERED IN THE DRAFT EIS

- Land Use Impacts
- Farmland Impacts
- Social Impacts including Environmental Justice (includes tolling analysis)
- Relocation Impacts
- Economic Impacts (includes tolling analysis)
- Transportation Impacts
- Multi-Agency Planning (i.e. coordination with VIA Metropolitan Transit)
- Considerations Relating to Pedestrians and Bicyclists
- Air Quality Impacts
- Noise Impacts
- Geology/Soils
- Avoid/minimize adverse water quality Impacts

- Wetland Impacts
- Water Body Modifications
- Floodplain Impacts
- Vegetation Impacts
- Wildlife Impacts
- Threatened or Endangered Species
- Historic and Archeological Impacts
- Hazardous Waste Sites
- Visual Impacts
- Energy
- Construction Impacts
- Indirect Impacts
- Cumulative Impacts
- Mitigation and Permit Requirements
- Public Involvement



# How to Record and Submit Your Comments

#### At the Meeting:

- Fill out a comment card and drop in the comment box and/or
- Give your comments verbally to the Court Reporter

#### **After the Meeting:**

- Submit comments (through Monday, May 10, 2010)
  - Fax to (210) 495-5403
  - E-mail to US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org
  - Website www.411on281.com/US281EIS
- Mail written comments (through Monday, May 10, 2010)
   to:

US 281 EIS Team

Alamo Regional Mobility Authority

1222 N. Main Avenue, Suite 1000

San Antonio, Texas 78212

The presentation and exhibits from tonight's meeting are available for download at <a href="https://www.411on281.com/US281EIS">www.411on281.com/US281EIS</a>



# COURT REPORTER

All verbal comments given to the Court Reporter will be included in the Public Meeting Record



**APPENDIX D Photos** 
















































































**APPENDIX E Master Comment Listing** 



# Public Meeting #3 -- Master Comment Listing

The master comment listing below includes all comments received, in alphabetical order by commenter, as well as the corresponding reference number and response number. Each comment is presented verbatim as it was received in **Section 4.0**. Scanned images of each written comment are included in **Appendix F** and the court reporter transcript of verbal comments is included in **Appendix G**. All comment responses are included in **Section 5**.

Reference					
#	Name	Comment Source	Response #		
13	Anonymous	Comment Card	25		
21	Anonymous	Comment Card	13, 17		
22	Anonymous	Comment Card	10		
75	Anonymous	Court Reporter	9, 24, 17		
68	Anonymous	Evaluation Form	7		
69	Anonymous	Evaluation Form	Comment Noted and Considered		
70	Anonymous	Evaluation Form	9, 30		
71	Anonymous	Evaluation Form	Comment Noted and Considered		
72	Anonymous	Evaluation Form	2, 28		
29	Baker, Samuel	E-Mail	9, 10, 19		
59	Barnes, Bob	Web	2, 4, 10, 11		
	Beck, Bernadette and		10, 11, 17		
5	Henry	Comment Card			
17	Bella, Peter	Comment Card	13		
52	Porel Mol	E-Mail	Specific Response see <b>Section 5.2</b>		
37	Borel, Mel Borst, Laura	E-Mail	14, 23, 22		
32	Bradshaw, Pat	E-Mail	7		
56	Byas, Forrest	E-Mail	2, 5, 6, 10		
86	Byler, Lloyd	Court Reporter	2, 10, 22, 30, 31		
34	Cagin, Dean	E-Mail	2, 4, 10, 16, 20		
34	Cardwell, John G. and	E-IVIAII	2, 4		
46	Beverly A.	E-Mail	2, 4		
9	Carnes, Don	Comment Card	2, 10, 11		
16	Chappelle, Bo	Comment Card	Comment Noted and Considered		
15	Chappelle, Raquel	Comment Card	Comment Noted and Considered		
10	Cheney, Wincy	Comment Card	2, 9		
33	Chin, David	E-Mail	10		
24	Clark, Tim	Comment Card	10, 32		
42	Cotner, M.D.	E-Mail	2, 4, 10		
57	de Greef, Nico	Web	2, 10, 21		
26	Dossey, Pat	Comment Card	2, 10, 11		
62	Drewa, David	Web	2, 10,		
64	Edwards, Richard	Web	2, 10		
4	Fisher, Jay and Louie	Comment Card	10, 17		

# Public Meeting #3 -- Master Comment Listing

Reference					
#	Name	Comment Source	Response #		
51	Ganschinietz, Lynn	E-Mail	2, 4, 10, 16, 20		
84	Garcia, Jorge	Court Reporter	10, 20		
74	Garcia, Marilyn	Court Reporter	2, 9, 10, 28		
45	Gardner, Bill	E-Mail	2, 4, 6, 9		
77	Goings, Howard	Court Reporter	9, 10, 11, 17		
40	Green, Dawn	E-Mail	2, 10		
8	Griego, Ron	Comment Card	10		
58	Haag, Bob	Web	2, 10, 17		
28	Hagg, Bob	E-Mail	2, 17, 18		
53	Hall, Terri	E-Mail	Specific Response see <b>Section 5.2</b>		
18	Hanak, Alfred J.	Comment Card	2, 4, 10, 16		
79	Hanak, Alfred J.	Court Reporter	2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 16, 29		
7	Harper, Steve	Comment Card	10, 11		
61	Heide, Jean	Web	2, 4, 10		
63	Helwig, Rosalinda	Web	3, 8, 10, 11, 17, 25		
81	Hoover, Richard	Court Reporter	2, 10		
65	Hudnall, Marlene	Web	2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 17, 24, 25, 27		
11	Kauffman, Greg	Comment Card	12		
43	Kinchen, Kerry	E-Mail	2, 5,6, 10,		
66	Kodet, Sasha	Web	10, 11		
27	Kopanski, Anthony	E-Mail	9, 10, 13, 16		
73	Marron, Patrick	Court Reporter	9, 10		
80	Maurer Sr., Mike	Court Reporter	2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 17, 24		
6	Maxwell, David	Comment Card	10		
23	McLaughlin, Mac	Comment Card	2, 10, 11, 32		
82	Merz, Scott	Court Reporter	2, 4, 10		
44	Migl, Babbie	E-Mail	9, 25		
12	Miller, Robert C.	Comment Card	Comment Noted and Considered		
48	Mireles, Meenu	E-Mail	20		
76	Ogden, Sid	Court Reporter	2, 4, 10, 11		
20	Owings, Erestine	Comment Card	2, 9, 10, 11		
78	Palliser, Lester	Court Reporter	2, 10		
67	Parks, Steven	Web	2, 4, 10, 11		
50	Patel, Sheela	E-Mail	10, 20		
39	Purdy, David J.	E-Mail	2, 22, 25		
	Renda, Daniel and		9, 10		
3	Barbara	Comment Card	0.4.5.04.00		
35	Richardson, Eugene	E-Mail	2, 4, 5, 21, 22		
1	Ritchie, Kathy	Comment Card	7		
54	Savage, David	E-Mail	2, 4, 10, 26		
19	Seaney, Shirley	Comment Card	7, 10, 15		

# Public Meeting #3 -- Master Comment Listing


Reference			
#	Name	Comment Source	Response #
83	Seguin, Russell	Court Reporter	9, 24, 10
36	Shaw, Carol	E-Mail	2, 10, 24
49	Slabaugh, Mark and Christina	E-Mail	2, 4, 10, 16, 17, 20
30	Solis, Renee	E-Mail	17, 10
55	Sturm, Jennifer	E-Mail	2, 10
25	Terrill, Jr., Bob	Comment Card	2, 8, 10, 11, 17, 24
38	Terrill, Jr., Bob	E-Mail	2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 24
60	Thompson, James	Web	2, 10, 11
31	Tobias, Robert	E-Mail	2, 13, 16,
14	Tucker, Audrey	Comment Card	10
47	Uhl, Mike and Beverly	E-Mail	2, 10, 11, 16, 17
41	Villafana, Javier	E-Mail	1, 10
2	Wall, Deborah	Comment Card	8
85	Wall, Deborah	Court Reporter	10, 20



**APPENDIX:** 

K f]lhYb'Di V`]W7 ca a Ybhg'UbX'A YYh]b[ 9 j Ui Uh]cb': cfa g'









# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

my opinion is there should be a high
Speed train septem not only in this area
but for all of San antonio. It seems a
giant waste of highway bunds to keep
finlding roads when a train system is
what to needed, who not bring S. A.
into the 21st contine ? In murarea
there are 3 different roots all going the
Same way. When? and I have seen this in
many other oreas also in S.A Continued on back
Name: 1 Kelchie
Address: City, State Zip
Lanantonis, JX 78233
ton but ritatile or amail com



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

70

Mease do surgening possible to
preserve yen integrity of the aquifer
If the source of water for the
•
We all suffer economically
Name:  Desorde M. Well
Address: 9 Nowood Crown City, State Zip 78248
Email: DebMwell & col. com



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

~ unit	- mulli	- riel	she	- Zu uun	2
is to	build	overpasse	s on	the br	west
intersect	ion an	& take	out	all	
traffin	lights	,			
10	<u> </u>				
****					
Name: Vaniel	L & Garbar	a Renda			
Address: 23/4	Estate Ga	te 🕼 . City, State	Zip San	antomo,	Tx: 18260
Email: danr	enda @ p	eople pc.	Com		



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

Janor Atternation # 2. Expressing. This atternation allows
a smooth access and a safe mayer to 28/ south and
north and permits a reduction in traffic longs to
The aternative (20,2) also appears to provide overgous
That would allow a more constant flow of traffice
which would containly improve the existing Condition
Tukile we favor Alternature#2, Please continue with
The suger street. Any improvement will be at what we
hour today.
<i>i</i>

Name: JAY & LOVIE FISHER

Address: 24215 BEAR CLAW

City, State Zip SAN ANTONIO, TX 7825X

Email: Jfachieve O aol. com (JAY) 4 believe O aol.com (Lovie)



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

Mank you for the open House. All 3 plans have is & -'s. I
appreciate the "band-aid" fix with the Michigan Left Turn Plan. It's not a waste
ef time or money trying to ease some of the congestion. (I'm only worried that by the time 2012 comes around, those Mich Lit. Plans will already be
that by the time 2012 comes around, those Mich Lit Plans will already be
over burdened.) I think #1 is a quick fix (or the quickest to Fix) and the
Cheapest. I can Gresee further expansion to #2 or #3 will be needed
by 2012 rolls around and its going to be another 3 years of EIS+ aguifer issues to then decide we need the larger plans.
admiter issues to then decide we need the larger plans.
I am Concerned about #1 the exits to Evans Lt possibly stone Oak (but mostly Evans)
will back up on 281 frust like the 281/1604 interchange because you need a
longer exit avenue for the Stone oderth folks. I would recommend an exit just past
Encino Rio to extend that avenue. Those Encino Rio tolks who need to get on
281 northbound will have to merge on the feeder road with that exiting
traffic + not join 281 until past Evans. (I use Encino Rio all the time now, so
I can say this -it's ok).
I'm leaning towards #2 plan and to start at Evans Road first, but #1 plan is along too if it gets the ball rolling faster.
Thank You again. Keep up the great work!
Name: Bernadette & Henry Beck
Address: 3106 Suble Creek City, State Zip Sun Antonio 7 78259

### Email:



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

I would like to ger the construction complete opt 1,2,013 as
soon as possible. I prifer opt 1012 due to
exit after marshulfed. I would also like to
See the construction that has the mining amount of
Impact on the presat traffic situation.
Name: David Maxwell
Address: 24 Hand is on, S.A.TX City, State Zip 78261
Email: Maximax4 all = GUTC. Con



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

all 1 1 10 Mb ( ) 1: 100 A: 1 - 1 M/ ( 2)
afternation 1: (1) Nothing (2) Temitel access Parist (3) Mot at all
(4) Would not serve the long term needs
alternative ?: (1) High flow w/ multiple access points (2) nothing
(3) Well suited to needs (4) best long-term solution
* I rate # alternating 2 as the best, alternative #1
as the worst and alternative 3 as in the middle
afternation #3: (1) better access than afternating #1 (2) Notas good
access: flow aget Z (3) Good, not bad, but not great
(4) poor long term solution
Name: STEVE HARPER
Address: 68/BRANDROAD City, State Zip BULV SRDE, TX 78/6 3
Email: SHARPER @ FOUR DUARTER & PANCH. COM

All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting #3 official record and considered by the US 281 EIS Team. After tonight's meeting, written comments can be e-mailed to <a href="US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org">US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org</a>, faxed to 210-495-5403 attention US 281 EIS Public Meeting #3, submitted through the website at <a href="www.411on281.com/US281EIS">www.411on281.com/US281EIS</a>, or mailed to US 281 EIS Team, c/o Alamo RMA, 1222 N.

Main Ste 1000, San Antonio, TX 78212.



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

	411	1:	40-		-	Λ	11 = -		- ^^.
	Hern	34106 =	42	Cxpre	2 msA		110002		rettu
	10 Ca	ative =	US Y	Flou	Siza	4	prever	its t	he
	Blu	that i	s ex	Perien	ced D	aily	•		
	Providu	- He	Acce	rs R	ood u	الآء	allow	6524	e of
	traffic	e to re	the expres	sory	and	Jcc	रिक्ट स्टि	ity t	e of business
	to be	Meint	erned -					l	117
-		112							
		No.				8			
					- 7100		100		
Name:	Row Gri	(elso						-	

Address: 24538 Lucca Mist

City, State Zip SA, TX 78260

Email: vonandvirge le lie.com



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

ike us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments
i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)
Option For II as long as there is 76 TO 14
Name: DON CARNES  Address: 5063 HAWK EYE City, State Zip Bulverede, TX78163
mail: JCARNES @ SATX, RR. COM



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

One year till next meeting - too long
to make decision as, to the
expansion of this Myway - It man
be extinct before it mosvesses
Rep it Toll FREE
Name: Wincy Cheney  Address: 4703 Mc (all (reek City, State Zip
Address: 4703 Mc Call Creek City, State Zip
Email: Wincycheney @ 9 Mail. com



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

THERE MUST BE FIVE TIMES THE NUMBER OF VEHICLES ON US 281

COMPARED TO ALL THE SIDE STREETS, WHY SO THE SIDE STREETS GET

EQUAL TIME ON GREEN TRAFFIC LIGHTS? MOST OF THE CARS COMMUTE

NORTH TOWARD BULVERDE, IF YOU WILL TURN THE LIGHTS GREEN FOR

S FULL MINUTES (CONTINUOUS), MUCH OF THE TRAFFIC WILL FLOW ON

THROUGH, THIS CYCLE SHOULD BE REPEATED EVERY THEATY MINUTES,

WHEN THE VEHICLES ON 281 DRIVE THROUGH THE INTERSECTION AT

10 MPH (BECAUSE THE CYCLE IS SO SHORT) IT SEVERELY LIMITS THE

FLOW. LEAVE THE LIGHTS GREEN LONGER TO INCREASE THE FLOW.

Name: GREG KAUFFMAN

Address: 24219 BEAR MOUNTAIN City, State Zip SAN ANDONIO TX 7828

Email: 6RtGKAKFMAN @ EARTHUNK, NET



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

suggestion Environm like us to	ns about the nental Impac be aware of	recommend t Statement as the EIS r	nt to the US 28  ded reasonable  (DEIS), our over  noves forward.  n, Expressway	alternative verall publi Please no	es being co c involvente te which a	nsidered i nent effor lternative	for inclusions, and any	on in the D	raft 18 you would	
ALTE	RNATI	VE Z	167		-				V2 0 0 1	
							102-			
							100.00			
	945	2000								
									25.0	
									10	_
	101° ak	323. 2	e e e e e e	in tu				LU-		
Name: 🗡	ROBERT	ren	11LLER	12			× 1			
Address:	21923	DOLO	MITE	City, S	State Zip	SAN,	ANTON	lio TX	7825	7
Email: /	MILLE	IZ-R	12346	5/30	GLUI	BAL,	NET		11	



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

	Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and
	suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft
	Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would
	like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments
	(i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)
	Uhn did we have to intidene maselaes in small group? Tim
•	Pacilisan starte lote Silve was slow-nissedanswer
(	Thought Dev she handed the cerved will
	good re-discussion/lescription of all
	Scile uno engineer - 508 (wrote pretty)
19	- Facilitate los control of group but got it but " Leffore
***	- Wild wild west but effective JR John
	(group#2) Studdaymich Spowscoike , Ok facilidator
	At 2 does hert job of needing purpose noed
	Name:
\	Address: City State 7in

Email: 20 min Fined Signents worked well to now prople between



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

	14th 2	AH#3
7.	Advantage Comment	1. Advantage
•	Mow is good	- Express lake to limiting &
	Eliminates trafficlique.	Flow Hixough
		_
2.	Disaduantag &	2: Disacrantage
	No Continous Flowlege	Linoted access to
	Enture growth timbed	Expressible.
	limits access to business	
		the state of the s
	Name: Hudrey Tucker	
	Address: 27306 Spiral Campo	ty, State Zip 3. A. 14 78261
	Email: atucker @gute. Co	M



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

After reviewing al	1 the	options	and attendin	g the	public	hearing,	Ŧ	like
the non-toll Exp				-				
9								<u> </u>
						<del></del>		
				N <sub>e</sub> -				
					- 600			
*******		24.				-	-	
e: Raquel Chappelle			NA II			-	<del></del>	
ress: 2718 Summit View			City, State Zip	SunAr	itanio, -	Tx 75261		
il: tchep681@juno.com								



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and
suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would
like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments
(i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)
I like # 2 Non (toll) the book!
Name: Bo Chappelle
Address: 2718 Summit View City, State Zip San IndonoTX 72761
Address: 2718 Summit View City, State Zip San Indono TX 78261 Email: Lohan 296 @ aahoo. Com
All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

The alternatives presented are very reasonable if your only
goal is to manage increased vehicular traffic based on
existing commuter patterns - the destinations north of
1604 served by 281 are bedroom communities with work
dostinations inside 1604. I see great value in holistic
sustainable community planning (corrent paradigm embraced
by DOT/EPA/HUD) for this corridor. What if work/
live/play locations were integrated atony & build
within the rider shed implied by 28/? What if seaple
within the rider shed implied by 28/? What if seaple did it need to leave their homes to travel 28/ as a corridor? Name: Peter Bella
Name: Peter Bella
Address: 110 Hibiscus Lane City, State Zip San Antonio, Tx 78213
Email: Phella@aacog.com



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

NO TO TOIL ROADS I BELIEVE THAT BUILD OVE	p CASS=
OFF LANES WITHOUT TO 11 ROADS. HOW LANES CANB	ZA
HELP. PLEASE USE ALL TAX DOLLARS FOR ROAD IMPR	OVEMEN
	1
Name: AIFRED J. HANAK	
address: 21538 PEANL SPRING City, State Zip SAN ANTONIO, TX 782	250
mail: None	· · · ·



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to t	he US 281 EIS process. P	lease let us know your tho	ughts, concerns, and				
suggestions about the recommended rea	asonable alternatives bein	g considered for inclusion	in the Draft				
Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would							
like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments							
(i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)							
			<del></del>				
		a and 11 -1					
Name: Notasha Smal	12	0					
Address: 25/215 Wagla Email: Snotashalavot	City, State Z	tip San Anton	19 TK 7826				
Email: Snotasha1@vot	mail com						



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

I believe Alt #2 non-toll in the best option that addresses all of the areas of Growth Sofety, I from the Sofety,
addresses all of the overs of Growth Sofety,
Fretienality and Quality of Cife.
It make no sense to toll 281 N as apposed
It makes no sense to toll 281 N as apposed to greater traveled roads in San autorio ie. 135 or I 10 which include much more travita
I35 or I 10 which include much more transits
traffice as apposed to local + tourest traffic on 281.
a from Wigness to Season and CT to though Saturday to the Comment

Name: Shirley Sconey
Address: 30260 Bridlegate Dr

City, State Zip Bulunde TX 78163

### Email:



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

alternative 2 or Expression "seems to be the
best. alternative 1 "Overpass Expansion"
would be second best if alternative 2 is too
expensive and would talk take too much time
main thing-no-toll!
alternative 3- Elevated may not be
as safe in inclement weather
Hurry ap & finish,

Name: Ernestine Owings

Address: (3798 FM471W City, State Zip San Cintonio, Jy 78253

# Email:

All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting #3 official record and considered by the US 281 EIS Team. After tonight's meeting, written comments can be e-mailed to <a href="US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org">US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org</a>, faxed to 210-495-5403 attention US 281 EIS Public Meeting #3, submitted through the website at <a href="www.411on281.com/US281EIS">www.411on281.com/US281EIS</a>, or mailed to US 281 EIS Team, c/o Alamo RMA, 1222 N. Main Ste 1000, San Antonio, TX 78212.



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

Personally, I do	not agree	Dith any of
the afternative		
only gerve s		
opposed to di		a
traffic and a		
whole city new	eds an ac	livstment
from the in		
coming to		1_
ronson. Consta	action an	thin "suspratroot
will create v	more traff	lic, and in turn,
Name:		D'ill possibly not
Name: Address:	City, State Zip	oe long-standing

Email:

All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting #3 official record and considered by the US 281 EIS Team. After tonight's meeting, written comments can be e-mailed to <a href="US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org">US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org</a>, faxed to 210-495-5403 attention US 281 EIS Public Meeting #3, submitted through the website at <a href="www.411on281.com/US281EIS">www.411on281.com/US281EIS</a>, or mailed to US 281 EIS Team, c/o Alamo RMA, 1222 N. Main Ste 1000, San Antonio, TX 78212.



# US 281 Environmental Impact Statement Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010 Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

ElevATED ExPRESSURY-	Do NOT LIKE
	This ALTERNATIUE
	BS CAUSE it would
	ENCREASE NOISE Level
	living near the expenses
Name:	
Address: Cit	y, State Zip
Email:	

All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting #3 official record and considered by the US 281 EIS Team. After tonight's meeting, written comments can be emailed to US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org, faxed to 210-495-5403 attention US 281 EIS Public Meeting #3, submitted through the website at www.411on281.com/US281EIS, or mailed to US 281 EIS Team, c/o Alamo RMA, 1222 N. Main Ste 1000, San Antonio, TX 78212.



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

all 3 afternatives seen reasonable, porovided they are
NOT TOIL Roads. Expossion of Blance of Bulmende should
be part of all of the alternatives. Lock of alternative sout
when there are accidents on the main road is a problem.
this is the first time in 5 years I have seen proposals
that have made sence.
No Toll Roads

Name: Mac MELaughlin

Address: 26211 Lookout Fls City, State Zip SATX 78260

Email: Mac 99507@ Yahoo. com

All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting #3 official record and considered by the US 281 EIS Team. After tonight's meeting, written comments can be e-mailed to <a href="US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org">US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org</a>, faxed to 210-495-5403 attention US 281 EIS Public Meeting #3, submitted through the website at <a href="www.411on281.com/US281EIS">www.411on281.com/US281EIS</a>, or mailed to US 281 EIS Team, c/o Alamo RMA, 1222 N. Main Ste 1000, San Antonio, TX 78212.



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

O Separato expunsión 2 Blanco e
O Separate expunsion of Blanco e Bulnerales as distinct options
D Widen Bulverde - this well
help & presque on 281
Name: I'm C/Ar/C
Address: 550 TRC Pokuly City, State Zip SA, TX 7826
Email: Eclart 010 @ Agl com

All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting #3 official record and considered by the US 281 EIS Team. After tonight's meeting, written comments can be e-mailed to <u>US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org</u>, faxed to 210-495-5403 attention US 281 EIS Public Meeting #3, submitted through the website at <u>www.411on281.com/US281EIS</u>, or mailed to US 281 EIS Team, c/o Alamo RMA, 1222 N. Main Ste 1000, San Antonio, TX 78212.



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center

Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

MY CONCERNS ARE FAXATION OF USER FEES & HEAQUEFER.
I LEVE IN ENCENO PARK of have lots OF FAMILY OFF OF
BOGGE FEEL of 1863 placing atall wall BE A hopey Burdon For
me of my fremely. WE can't continue to buill of gave over the
LEChange ZONE, WE Already home water restrictions In place
of the more we pare the less the For water to truckle who
the Abusper. I think we should take the money For the
"Super street" of put towards option #1 or #3
Keep this corridor "Free". Projecty values are surroms
BECAUSE OF IN Action of FEAR OF A TOU ROAD, ENGER
Name: BOBTerroll 5.
Address: City, State Zip S.A. Tk. 28259
Email: TERRBHT 2000 Pyshoo. Com 210-481-3674

All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting #3 official record and considered by the US 281 EIS Team. After tonight's meeting, written comments can be e-mailed to <a href="US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org">US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org</a>, faxed to 210-495-5403 attention US 281 EIS Public Meeting #3, submitted through the website at <a href="www.411on281.com/US281EIS">www.411on281.com/US281EIS</a>, or mailed to US 281 EIS Team, c/o Alamo RMA, 1222 N. Main Ste 1000, San Antonio, TX 78212.



US 281 Environmental Impact Statement
Public Meeting #3 – April 29, 2010
Summit Christian Center



Your comments are very important to the US 281 EIS process. Please let us know your thoughts, concerns, and suggestions about the recommended reasonable alternatives being considered for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), our overall public involvement efforts, and any other items you would like us to be aware of as the EIS moves forward. Please note which alternative when recording your comments (i.e. No Build, Overpass/Expansion, Expressway, and Elevated Expressway.)

OVERPASS/EXPANSION PLANS
I THINK THIS IS BEST PLAN BECAUSE
WE CAN AFFORD IT - NO TOLLS
TOLL ROADS ARE RACIST ELITEST MISTREATMENT OF WORKING
MISTREATMENT OF WORKING
PEOPLE.
Name: NAT DOSSEY
Name: NAT DOSSEY  Address: ZOZ BASSWOOD DR City, State Zip SAN ANDONIO TX 78213

# Email:

All written comments must be received or postmarked by Monday, May 10, 2010, to be part of the Public Meeting #3 official record and considered by the US 281 EIS Team. After tonight's meeting, written comments can be e-mailed to <a href="US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org">US281EIS@AlamoRMA.org</a>, faxed to 210-495-5403 attention US 281 EIS Public Meeting #3, submitted through the website at <a href="www.411on281.com/US281EIS">www.411on281.com/US281EIS</a>, or mailed to US 281 EIS Team, c/o Alamo RMA, 1222 N. Main Ste 1000, San Antonio, TX 78212.



Comments submitted via Email	



Sent: Sun 4/11/2010 11:12 AM

You replied on 4/12/2010 10:51 AM.

# US281EIS

From: Anthony Kopanski [kopanski317@hotmail.com]

US281EIS

To:

Cc:

Subject: Comment on HOT lanes

Attachments:

Dear sir,

I strongly disagree with the use of HOT lanes. The HOT lanes and HOV lanes are one of the biggest waste of tax payer's money ever invented.

I have driven in areas of the USA where HOT lanes are in use. In Houston along I-10 there there is heavy traffic on the highway while the HOT lane is empty. In the Los Angeles, CA area when driving west towards Corona the same pattern occurs; empty HOT lane with the regular highway stopped in bumper to bumper traffic. Driving along I-405 in Los Angeles, CA I observe an empty HOV lane with bumper to bumper traffic in the regular lanes.

No one changes their driving patterns because there is an HOV or HOT lane. Neighbors do not live and work adjacent to each other. If they can carpool great. But the fact that a HOV lane is available is not an incentive to car pool.

Taxpayers dollars would be better spent by adding the proper amount of lanes needed to carry the traffic.

A quick short term fix that is not being used is adding to the problem and creating excessive air pollution. The northbound portion of 281 between Evans Road and TCP (Stone Oak) is currently 2 lanes. This portion of road is bumper to bumper traffice, gridlock, between 3 PM and 6 PM every day. There is adaquate room, utilizing the existing sholders, to repaint the lines for 3 northbound lanes. By making this section of road 2 lanes you are creating gridlock every day. This could be easilly fixed by repainting the lines.

Take the HOT lane concept off the table. In is not a cost effective solution.

Thanks,

Anthony Kopanski

(210) 218-9889

Hotmail is redefining busy with tools for the New Busy. Get more from your inbox. See how.

Sent: Mon 4/12/2010 4:13 PM

📵 You replied on 4/15/2010 5:37 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Bob Haag [bobhaag@sbcglobal.net]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: 281 North past 1604

Attachments:

I wish you would STOP the push for toll roads!!!! I know the "Super Street" is just a stall until 2012, when the new legislature reconvenes. At least now you can tell everyone that "you are doing something". The problem is that this just helps make the toll road answer cheaper. If you would spend that money on bridges and overpasses, you could have the first five miles done by 2012. But that just makes too much sense for you purposes, which is to generate another cash flow avenue. We are not stupid; we know what you are doing. Like the politicians, you are not listening to the people.

The formation of the EIS Peer Technical Review Committee is further proof that you are not listening to the people but are doing what YOU want to do. This program goes along with the Health Care debacle. Let's just keep taking money from the people, they won't know until it's too late. Communism comes to Texas.

Sincerely,

Bob Haag

Sent: Mon 4/12/2010 10:14 PM

You replied on 4/15/2010 5:36 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Sam Baker [sambaker@gvtc.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: Hwy 281

Attachments:

US 281 Environmental Impact Statement

Alamo Regional Mobility Authority

1222 N Main Avenue, suite 1000

San Antonio, Texas 78212

Dr. William E. Thornton,

I do not in any way claim to be an expert on anything except what one learns from living for seventy two years. In that length of time I learned that you can not make the sand flow through an hour glass any faster than the glass is designed to allow the sand to flow.

I find it very hard to have any confidence in anyone or any group that would be foolish enough to end a freeway with three of four lanes of traffic allowed to go sixty five miles per hour into a highway with only two or three lanes, reduce the speed by fifteen miles per hour and also install a number of red lights within the first two or three miles of the highway. Are you people out of your mind?

Why spend another year or more scratching your head with your *studies* that mean nothing, but costing millions of dollars while the traffic just gets worse. Is there nobody that can have the balls to make a decision to extend the freeway at least to the county line or as far as highway 46. I don't care how it is paid for. Toll road is great as far as I'm concerned. At least it would be paid for by the ones who caused the problem by moving out here and use it, me included.

What is being done now is a brainless plan that will waste a few more million dollars and not make a bit of difference. The only way to releave the conjecton is to *elimnate all red lights on Highway 281*.

I hope you will favorably consider the last sentance of the previous paragraph and move in that direction. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Samuel Baker, Ph.D PO Box 591464 San Antonio, Texas 78259-0122

In GOD "We The People" Trust! Wake Up America! Take Our Country Back! Prepare To Do Whatever It Takes!

Note: If you forward this to your email friends, please remove my name and email address before forwarding. It helps prevent the spread of worms and viruses, and removes the possibility of identity theft. Thanks!

Sent: Tue 4/13/2010 11:21 AM

1 You replied on 4/15/2010 5:39 PM.

### US281EIS

From: Alamo RMA Community Relations

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: FW: Super Street

Attachments:

Please add to record and comment - this is US 281 EIS related

Leroy D. Alloway

Director, Community Development

Alamo Regional Mobility Authority

From: Renée Solis [mailto:reneer0729@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 13, 2010 9:05 AM **To:** Alamo RMA Community Relations

Subject: Super Street

I was wondering if constructing overpasses with a combined turn around system to <u>cross over 281</u> was considered? (I'm thinking of an overpass in the downtown area that is on Commerce. I thinks it's near the Bexar County Jail.) The traffic on 281 would continue to flow and those needing to cross over 281 wouldn't have traffic lights to contend with until they crossed over the highway. There could be an overpass/turn around system at Evans Rd. and Stone Oak Pkwy/TPC Pkwy as those are two areas with the most congestion. There could be at least (2) lanes of continuous flowing traffic going N and S on 281. If someone needed to exited on Encio Rio going N, then there could be a right turning lane. If they needed to exit Encio Rio going S, then they would need to take the turn around up at 281/1604. For Evans Rd, Stone Oak Pkwy, TPC Pkwy and Marshall Rd. then there could be turn only lanes for the left and for the right and they could merge with the flow of traffic going across the overpass. The speed limit on those roads are 40, so it would be easier for someone to merge at that speed. And it wouldn't completely stop the flow of traffic for those wanting to travel past all those intersections and for those wanting to just cross over 281.

I don't know if that makes sense and I fully understand that it is more complicated than the public thinks, but it was just an idea. An idea that's difficult to put in writing. For what it's worth, thank you for the efforts to finally make the traveling on 281 outside of 1604 more efficient!

Have a Blessed Day,

Mrs. Renée Solis

Sent: Wed 4/14/2010 8:40 AM

You replied on 4/15/2010 5:34 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Robert Tobias [rtobias@cityofpecos.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: 281 Plans

Attachments:

I was and am a proponent of toll roads or HOV lanes and other initiatives that favor those that vanpool, carpool, etc. I was a proponent of Cintra building toll roads and each time I get stuck in traffic leaving or entering our home, I want to showcase a banner saying "Thanks Toll Road Party".

I live in Lookout Canyon off of Outlook Parkway and Canyon Golf Road. As we all know, there continues to be significant housing and commercial development taking place throughout this corridor. We love our area, with the exception of transportation matters.

We are originally from Houston and are accustomed to toll roads and HOV lanes. However, we have seen HOV lanes in California that are bounded by lesser expensive methods than Houston has used in their concrete barriers.

The Alamo RMA should be encouraging families and businesses to carpool, vanpool and should consider HOV lanes to reward them for their support, while longer term solutions are considered and implemented. Help us keep our quality of life. Thanks for all your organization is doing to prepare and position SA for increased growth and prosperity.

Robert M. Tobias, Jr.

**Executive Director** 

Pecos Economic Development Corporation (PEDC)

503 S. Cypress

P.O. Box 1493

Pecos, TX 79772

(432) 445-9960 Phone

(432) 445-9945 Fax

(432) 940-8613 Cell

rtobias@cityofpecos.com

http://www.townofpecoscitytx.com/

Sent: Thu 4/15/2010 9:38 AM

3 You replied on 4/15/2010 5:31 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Patricia Bradshaw [LosBrads@satx.rr.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

**Subject:** Comments for Public Meeting #3

Attachments:

I am a resident of Lookout Canyon use the 281 corridor daily. I would like to submit a couple of recommendations/comments for the Public Meeting this month:

Has the city considered expanding public transportation (VIA) options further north?

Has the city considered adding public transportation routes to/from military bases (needs assessment might reveal a surprising number of residents that live north of 1604 but commute to Fort Sam, Lackland, Randolph and Port of San Antonio.

We could use police officer patrol in one area in particular where drivers attempt to "cheat/jockey" their way into traffic (northbound on 281 at the Evans intersection—cars will routinely stay in the far right, right turn only lane, only to whip into the center lane while IN the intersection still travelling north. I've seen many close calls and incidents of road frustration/rage). The other problem area is northbound on 281 immediately after you travel under 1604, where 3 lanes combine into 2. Drivers again will speed up in the far right lane and then cut the center lane off... or they try to muscle their way in while traffic attempting to merge in from Sonterra is also trying to merge into that lane.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of these comments.

Respectfully,

Pat Brashaw

Patricia N. Bradshaw

1632 Overlook Creek

San Antonio, TX 78260

830-980-6705 home

LosBrads@satx.rr.com

Sent: Fri 4/23/2010 8:05 PM

You replied on 4/26/2010 10:01 AM.

# US281EIS

From: David Chin [dlchin@pol.net]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: comment for 281 corridor meeting

Attachments:

As a resident of the Encino Park area, I go to work each weekday morning by driving to highway 281 on Evans Rd and turn left to head to San Antonio.

I think that the idea of having overpasses is a good idea for each of the existing intersections that have traffic lights.

Have at least two lanes in each direction that go over the intersection with the traffic light so that vehicles that do not need to turn at the intersections do not have to stop. Only those needing to turn left or right, or entering 281 would need to encounter the traffic lights using the outer lanes.

Turnaround lanes could also be built into the overpasses for those no on the overpasses.

It is my understanding that the money to do this has already been allocated for this and we just need to get the work started.

It would also be good to get started with interchange ramps between Loop 1604 and highway 281 for ALL directions.

Sincerely,

David Chin 2318 Encino Mist San Antonio, TX 78259

You replied on 4/28/2010 1:43 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Dean [cagin@satx.rr.com] Sent: Mon 4/26/2010 6:53 PM

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: US 281 EIS Comments

Attachments:

\* Increase lanes from a total of six (6) lanes to eight (8) lanes by utilizing the center median for two (2) more lanes. One (1) additional lane in both

directions. Dedicate the additional inside lanes (fast lanes) to HOV traffic only.

- \* Centerline median barrier to separate north and south traffic
- Construct overpasses on Evans Rd. to go over US 281.
- Construct overpasses on Stone Oak Pkwy. over US 281
- \* Freeway lanes. No toll on all lanes.
- \* HOV lanes require 2 or more people in vehicle. No Trucks.
- \* Sound barrier wall along residential area of Big Springs, south of Evans Rd., west side of US 281
- \* Construct with existing Texas gas tax revenue and Federal Hwy monies.

Sent: Mon 4/26/2010 7:06 PM

📵 You replied on 4/28/2010 1:45 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Gene Richardson [erichardson3@satx.rr.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: Comments on US 281 EIS

Attachments:

To: Alamo RMA

Texans do not desire tolls to finance improvements to existing roads. Adding tolls to existing freeways amounts do a double taxation. There is no justification for charging taxpayers to use a highway that has already had its right-of-way and existing infrastructure already paid for.

Tolling US 281 will cause drivers to turn already congested neighborhood streets, such as Stone Oak Parkway, into highways as drivers seek alternative routes, thereby increasing the risk to the traveling public. Moreover, the National Transportation Safety Board, NTSB, recently concluded that toll roads, with the accompanying toll plazas, are more accident prone than traditional freeways! In an April 2006 report, the NTSB stated that backups caused by a toll booth contributed to a major accident in Illinois. "The board noted that traditional toll plazas...interrupt the flow of high-speed traffic and tend to increase the incidence of rear-end collisions," according to the NTSB report.

Making US 281 a toll way would be the most expensive, most environmentally damaging, and most invasive option which is not in the public's overall best interest.

My vote is to add overpasses and access roads within the right-of-way already purchased with our tax dollars. Paying tolls to drive on it would be outrageous.

I add that I am outraged that the Alamo RMA spend scarce money to mail me two copies of a flyer that provided absolutely no information. This money would be better spent on financing desperately required improvements to US 281.

Sincerely, Eugene S. Richardson 22723 Sabine Summit San Antonio, Texas 78258

Sent: Thu 4/29/2010 8:54 AM

You replied on 4/29/2010 9:15 AM.

This message was sent with high importance.

# US281EIS

Shaw, Carol L Ms CIV USA MEDCOM AMEDDCS From:

[Carol.Shaw@AMEDD.ARMY.MIL]

US281EIS To:

Cc:

Subject: US 281 EIS Comment

Attachments:

Pls. verify that the below is a part of your official record. Thanks.

All options for highway 281 need to remain non-tolled. Want the original plan of overpasses plus one additional lane in each direction. No tolls! We refuse!!

Ms. Carol Shaw

3335 Highline Trail

San Antonio, TX 78261

📵 You replied on 5/3/2010 3:32 PM.

# US281EIS

From: rebelljb@aol.com [rebelljb@aol.com] Sent: Thu 4/29/2010 12:56 PM

To: US281EIS

**Cc:** ljcurtis@indytexans.org; bft0852@yahoo.com; john.t.tate@campaignforliberty.com; tburke@aclutx.org;

aromero@aclu.org; coney@epic.org; information@eff.org; bjklein@sbcglobal.net

Subject: My concerns about the US 281 toll road

### Attachments:

I am concerned about some problems that would likely be caused by the US 281 toll road. I am concerned not only about its potential to facilitate surveillance, due to remote payment via RFID-chip embedded Easy Passes in cars utilizing this toll road. I am also concerned about the potential for eminent domain abuses. This road would likely be very wide, because I have read that toll roads proposed as part of the Trans Texas Corridor, which I am concerned the proposed US 281 would be integrated into, would be several lanes wide. This could be nearly a mile wide. It has been proposed to concentrate other infrastructure, such as utility conduits, within the course of the toll roads. This could be dangerous in an accident.

(My name is Laura Borst. My address is 10727 Holly Springs, Houston, TX 77042.)

Sent: Sat 5/1/2010 1:04 PM

📵 You replied on 5/3/2010 10:31 AM.

# US281EIS

From: Bob Terrill Jr [terrbht2000@yahoo.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc: terrbht2000@yahoo.com

Subject: 281 Corridor

Attachments:

To whom it may concern,

I live in Encino Park and I have been to just about every MPO and or TxDot meeting held in the area on this subject. I can not believe the way the system has changed since this has all begun. We have more agencies involved in the process and more grid lock and nothing being done to fix the problem. Just a lot of arguing and finger pointing. As a tax paying citizen of San Antonio my whole life I don't care that you mismanaged the gas tax money or that you spent it on something other than fixing and building roads. I just want the 281 and 1604 fixed as was promised before I moved my family out to Encino Park. A Toll Road was never mentioned and never in the mix till four years later. I would have never invested my hard earned dollars in this community IF I had known there was even the possibility of there being a toll road. I am sure there are thousands in this area that feel the same way. IF the current system of collecting taxes is not sufficient then we need to look at another system BUT the public is not going to accept this till you stop mismanaging the funds and diverting them from the purpose of building and maintaining roads. (Stop wasting money on things that don't build or fix roads) I don't think the toll road will fix the congestion problem because of the added cost to people who use this corridor and since we apparently don't have the money and probably not a good idea to continue to pave over the recharge zone we need to just build some over passes for now to help. It is my opinion that if we build overpasses over existing cross streets with lights that this will go a long way to getting thru traffic in and out of this corridor. Future developers will need to pay for frontage roads to get customers into and out of there businesses. I've read the book of comments at the MPO meeting on April 29th. Sure looks like most people don't want the Toll Option. Please listen to the people we are trying to tell you what we want and need to fix the problem we live and work here and we know what is best.

Thank you,

Bob Terrill Jr.

21414 Encino Caliza

San Antonio TX 78259

210-481-3674

Sent: Sun 5/2/2010 2:10 PM

🚺 You replied on 5/3/2010 10:40 AM.

This message was sent with high importance.

## US281EIS

From: Dave [djpampromotions@world-net.net]

To: Jaclynn Fragoso US281EIS Cc:

Subject: Public input on tolls requested

Attachments:

# Dear RMA:

I was not able to attend the meetings last Thursday or Friday although I certainly wished to! Fact is, afternoons in general aren't good for most people as we are too busy working in today's competitive economy to come to meetings like that and Thursday I had an Dr's appointment on the other side of town! I think all such meetings should be in the evening hours when the greatest number of people can attend and such afternoon hours for meetings lend themselves to charges that these meetings are being designed to lessen mainstream, public participation by choice of hours and location which is why there is so much distrust toward your agency by so many people.

I want my opposition to tolling personal vehicles noted and my complete opposition to taking away or lessening lanes on present, public infrastructure highways that are already paid for for the free use of personal vehicles to be turned into toll roads. I am also opposed to selling public infrastructure to a private interest and feel that there can be a place for RMAs as government agencies verses the TXDoT monopoly on roadways but only when they operate in good faith for the public good. I have no problem with providing designated toll lanes for commercial vehicles of 6 wheels or more and heavy weight, semitrailer dimensions who can pay tolls and pass their extra wear and tear cost on highways onto their customers being added to present roads but not altering the public right to free use of public roadways already there.

There are alternative, funding sources for roads that should be investigated to pay for highway maintenance such as consensual gaming on a county-option basis for metro areas. I think vehicle registration costs should be raised on nonUS assembled vehicles in general and luxury or sports cars in particular rather than tolling individually owned vehicles using unconstitutional methods of sending bills in the mail and tracking their comings and goings! All tolls should be through toll booth pay as you use systems that take some type of credit/debit cards instead of requiring toll tags unless that is what the individual company wants to do for their own practical reasons! What is most efficient is not democratic and trying to jam mandatory toll tags and photo billing/checks in the mail systems down peoples' throats is why you have such hostile receptions at your meetings!

Using photo identification of vehicle plates to send bills in the mail is unconstitutional, unreliable and lends itself to unacceptable abuse and I will oppose such initiatives with every fiber of my being! Politicians who support photo tracking of personal vehicles/mandatory toll tags are going to find out what awaits them when they are voted out of office which is going to happen soon. Governor Rick Perry and his crooked TXDoT flunkies need to go and will go soon! Jeff Wentworth will never see higher political office and will lose his Chairmanship of the Judicial Affairs Committee once Gov Rick Perry is discredited! Chico Rodriguez and Kevin Wolff will also never see higher office and hopefully the exit door to their political careers once Governor Rick Perry is gone!

The RMA has been smart not to identify too closely with Bartel Zachry and their political flunkies mentioned here who have upset too many people for too long! I don't have the axe to grind with you all that I have with others due to what I witnessed at an MPO Meeting not too long ago but it is up to you to keep it that way!

Thank You:

David J. Purdv 8181 Tezel Rd #12097 SA, TX 78250

---- Original Message -----From: Jaclynn Fragoso

Sent: Mon 5/3/2010 11:14 AM

3:27 PM

# US281EIS

From: Green, Dawn [dGreen@Halff.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: US281

Attachments:

I live and work along the US281 corridor and drive this road every day. I am for the Expressway or Elevated Expressway options and I am for toll roads. It is time to get this area moving.

Thanks,

Dawn Green, PE



Director of Business Development

HALFF ASSOCIATES, INC.

300 E. Sonterra Blvd., Suite 230

San Antonio, Texas 78258

Phone 210-798-1895

Fax 210-798-1896

Cell 210-414-2911

www.halff.com

Sent: Mon 5/3/2010 12:19 PM

You replied on 5/3/2010 3:29 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Javier Villafana [jvillafana73@yahoo.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc: jesus.moulinet@jacobs.com

Subject: US 281 comments for recommended alternatives

Attachments:

To Alamo RMA,

I recently attended public meeting #3 on April 29, 2010 and found it to be very informative. I left without filling out my comment card, so I thought this might be a good way to give my input.

All representatives I spoke with at the public meeting stated that the City's land use planning was not yet considered in the alternatives. Although the City of San Antonio's land use planning for Hill Country Sector is not yet completed, it should be adopted sometime this summer by City Council. I strongly recommend consideration of the Hill Country Sector Land Plan in its draft form (for reference), and City adopted final version, as a basis to validate future planning growth scenarios to ensure safety, functionality, and accommodate growth.

After considering all the alternatives presented, and having some insight into the City's Hill Country Sector land planning, I strongly recommend a flexible plan that can realisticly support all financial options (non-toll preferably), and promote local economic growth while balancing the existing character and landscape of the area. Sounds like much to consider, but the logical choice is alternative #2. Alternative #2 stands out as the most effective plan that addresses all the governing issues of safety, functionality, growth, and quality of life.

I do hope you consider my comments in your efforts to finalize a flexible plan that is feasible, and supported by the public. Thank you.

Javier Villafana Project Manager VMDG & Associates, LLC

Sent: Wed 5/5/2010 10:21 AM

3 You replied on 5/5/2010 1:15 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Dolores O. Gutierrez [d821@sbcglobal.net]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: Roads

Attachments:

# To Whom it May Concern:

Stop hijacking our gas tax money for projects having nothing to do with road building.

Stop trying to turn our roads whether already established or about to be built into toll roads.

Stop trying to sneak in toll roads by another name.

Stop abusing the tax payers of this State.

Stop acting as if you are doing this for our own good when we know its for you and your homies.

Stop giving away the taxpayers roads to foreign or domestic companies to profit from.

M.D. Cotner

**Sent:** Wed 5/5/2010 11:11 AM

You replied on 5/5/2010 1:13 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Kerry Kinchen [kkinchen@satx.rr.com]

US281EIS

To: Cc:

Subject: Regional Mobility Authority, re. 281

Attachments:

I do not want a toll on 281. Instead of eliminating congestion or adequately handle future growth, it will only push the congestion to the access roads and neighborhood streets, making our roads less safe and will not improve air quality. Therefore the alternative proposed does not meet the purpose and need of the project.

Kerry Kinchen 31416 Sunlight Dr. Bulverde, Texas, 78163

Phone: 210-260-8585

Sent: Wed 5/5/2010 1:44 PM

You replied on 5/6/2010 10:22 AM.

US281EIS

From: Babbie Migl [dbmigl@gvtc.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: Reality

Attachments:

Dear Sir or Madam:

I recently attended your latest meeting and I am sorely disappointed in the way you do things. How much does it cost for you to create these brochures and visual presentations, much less pay your employees to work at these events? You ask for our comments and then you TOTALLY ignore everything we say. Oh yes - you did show a non-tolled plan just to appease us, but then said it would not help to speed up traffic in any way. If you would check the recently built toll lanes in other places, you would see that people are not using them and the states are having to pay for the losses to a foreign company. No telling what we could have accomplished with the money you waste on these meetings!

You replied on 5/6/2010 10:21 AM.

# US281EIS

From: Bill Gardner [bgardner@satx.rr.com] Sent: Wed 5/5/2010 6:23 PM

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: Traffic conditions on 281

Attachments:

We the owners of this highway are fed up with all the political nonsense and continuing environmental studies. Where were the environmental impact studies when the developers were allowed to build all the residential subdivisions and commercial businesses?

These are our highways that have been paid for once. Now they need to be expanded. The federal funds are there, so let us begin. How is it that it's okay environamentally if it's a toll road, but not if it's an expansion to what is already there? The land has been studied over and over. Again, stop the nonsensene and build the overpasses. Also, what damage is being done to the environment by having hundreds of automobiles creeping along bumber to bumber expelling all that dirty exhaust?

I am so mad, I can't think to put this message in proper order, but you get the message.

Sent: Thu 5/6/2010 9:31 AM

You replied on 5/6/2010 10:18 AM.

# US281EIS

From: Garry Cardwell [garry8790@gmail.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: US281 toll road options

Attachments:

Dear Sirs,

We wish to go on record as being strongly opposed to any US281 improvement option that includes new tolls for the use of our public highways. The gas tax we pay now should be used for its intended purpose, which includes upgrading existing public highways.

Thank you,

John G and Beverly A Cardwell 18927 De Enclave San Antonio, 78258

Sent: Thu 5/6/2010 2:08 PM

You replied on 5/6/2010 2:27 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Leroy Alloway

To: US281EIS

Cc:

**Subject:** FW: road improvements

Attachments:

Leroy D. Alloway

Director, Community Development

Alamo Regional Mobility Authority

From: Scott Ericksen [mailto:Ericksen@sametroplan.org]

Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 1:55 PM

To: Leroy Alloway

Subject: FW: road improvements

From: Mike & Bev [mailto:muhl@gvtc.com] Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 9:58 AM

To: Jaclynn Fragoso

Subject: road improvements

My husband and I have attended five or six meetings about toll roads in San Antonio. At each meeting we and the majority of the people in attendance have made it abundantly clear that we are against toll roads. At the April 29 meeting a new term was presented-managed lanes, which is just another term for toll roads. We have seen the managed lanes in the Katy/Houston area. Traffic is very heavy on the portion of I-10 where no tolls are charged while the managed lanes have very little traffic. Just build overpasses on North Hwy 281 and add an additional lane or two for both directions. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out what the problem is. All you have to do is count the number of lanes on Hwy 281 south of Loop 1604 and compare that number to the number of lanes north of 1604 to see why North Hwy 281 is so congested. The Super Street project is a complete waste of our money. It would have been better spent by putting in one overpass.

Mike and Beverly Uhl

You replied on 5/7/2010 2:54 PM.

# US281EIS

From: meenumireles@aol.com [meenumireles@aol.com] Sent: Thu 5/6/2010 6:12 PM

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: 281 traffic

Attachments:

I am a home owner in Big Springs Village on the Glen. I am concerned about the noise that all the traffic is going to make and disturb my neighborhood. It should be put into the plans to construct a noise barrier wall or something for our subdivision. It is not acceptable to think that he homeowner's in our subdivision are out of luck and should not have bought in the neighborhood.

One of the reason I chose to build in Village on the Glen is because I was close to 281 and would not have to fight the traffic to get to 281.

Meenu Mireles

Home owner in VIIIage on the Glen--Big Springs

You replied on 5/7/2010 2:53 PM.

# US281EIS

From: Mark and Christina Slabaugh [cmslabaugh@gmail.com] Sent: Thu 5/6/2010 9:47 PM

To: US281EIS

Cc:

**Subject**: improvements

Attachments:

I would propose the following improvements.

Immediately make two left turning lanes at evans road going north on 281. Even with superhighway coming it will help traffic in mean time.

Additionally,

Increase lanes from a total of six (6) lanes to eight (8) lanes by utilizing the center median for two (2) more lanes. One (1) additional lane in both

directions. Dedicate the additional inside lanes (fast lanes) to HOV traffic only.

- Centerline median barrier to separate north and south traffic
- \* Construct overpasses on Evans Rd. to go over US 281.
- Construct overpasses on Stone Oak Pkwy. over US 281
- \* Freeway lanes. No toll on all lanes.
- \* HOV lanes require 2 or more people in vehicle. No Trucks.
- \* Sound barrier wall along residential area of Big Springs, south of Evans Rd., west side of US 281
- Construct with existing Texas gas tax revenue and Federal Hwy monies.

--

Mark and Christina Slabaugh

Sent: Thu 5/6/2010 9:57 PM

You replied on 5/7/2010 2:52 PM.

# US281EIS

sheela patel [sheelapp1@yahoo.com] From:

US281EIS To:

Cc:

Subject: no to the overpass on 281

Attachments:

My backyard is the 281 freeway, where the Big springs sign is. I furiously object to an over pass, which i will be able to view from my back windows. I moved in this neighborhood 11 years ago and I would never of purchased this home if a huge overpass was in my back yard. I know there is need for some improvements but you need to think of another way of improving the mess on 281.

Currently i have the pleasure of hearing beeping noise and other construction in my back yard, once again you didnt think of putting the noise barrier which was supposed to be have been put in several years ago because of the traffic.

so here are the reason not to put the overpass:

my back yard would be an overpass

my property value would drop

the noise would be deafening

would not look good.

I you want to do this, then purchase our homes and you can do what ever you want. This is something you should of done before all these apartment, homes, schools and businesses. Who ever did the planning and approving of these projects did a poor job in regards to traffic.

I patiently wait for another suggestion.

Thank you,

Good karma Sheela Patel

📵 You replied on 5/7/2010 2:52 PM.

# US281EIS

Lynn Ganschinietz [aunttielg@sbcglobal.net] From:

Sent: Fri 5/7/2010 10:09 AM

To: Cc:

US281EIS

Subject: US 281 EIS Comments

# Attachments:

Increase lanes from a total of six (6) lanes to eight (8) lanes by utilizing the center median for two (2) more lanes. One (1) additional lane in both

directions.

- \* Centerline median barrier to separate north and south traffic
- DO NOT construct overpass on Evans Rd. to go over US 281.
- Freeway lanes. No toll on all lanes.
- NO HOV lanes
- Sound barrier wall along residential area of Big Springs, south of Evans Rd., west side of US 281
- Construct with existing Texas gas tax revenue and Federal Hwy monies.
- Additional right hand turn lanes from Evans onto 281 South bound

① You replied on 5/10/2010 12:37 PM.

### US281EIS

From: Mel Borel [mborel@sbcglobal.net] Sent: Mon 5/10/2010 11:21 AM

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: Comments on 281 EIS Public Meeting of April 29, 2010

Attachments:

My comments regarding the public meeting for the 281 EIS are presented below. Please acknowledge receipt of my comments.

Mel Borel 703 Turtle Hill

San Antonio, Texas 78260 Phone: 210-403-3969

E-mail: mborel@sbcglobal.net

------ COMMENTS FOLLOW ------

-----

# Where's the common sense?

Three different options for improvements to 281 were presented. My comments to each are presented below. At the meeting it was very obvious that the majority of those in attendance were adamant in favor of NON TOLL ONLY. Many also were in favor of not "over spending" in the near term for future solutions. In effect, many, as myself, are opposed to mortgaging our future for the sake of near term solutions – if we can't afford it don't borrow the money or use "creative" financing to build it!

There are some analysis of the alternatives that defies common sense. For instance, there would be a net loss in speed by building the overpass expansion option (overpasses and added lane in each direction). Since it is obvious that the traffic lights are the primary inhibitor to speed, it defies common sense to say that today speeds are 25 MPH and once overpasses and two new lanes are built the average speed would be reduced to 20 MPH!

Alternative #1 - Overpass expansion plan - This adds overpasses and an extra lane in each direction. It allows for access to businesses through different means than the traditional access road model. Many states, such as Florida, feed traffic onto and off of highways using controlled access to the freeway via arterials roads rather than continuous frontage or access roads. This alternative with controlled access is the least invasive (has minimal footprint and right of way costs, less impact to the Edwards Aquifer, etc.), is likely the most affordable to construct, and it cannot be tolled which is the desire of the majority of those using 281! So this option has great potential. The current surface need not be totally destroyed and rebuilt to accommodate additional lanes – main lanes (tolled and non tolled) and frontage roads to satisfy some distorted view of providing equivalent free lanes. Therefore the cost of this option can be much less than all other options.

The drawbacks presented by the RMA can well be considered as positives for this option. Though, as presented by the RMA, a high number of driveways would lose freeway access, the plan would still give access to those businesses using different methods (see above). Some may also argue that this alternative may not handle future growth, but the RMA's own presentation says the corridor has a "low existing and forecasted population (2035) and employment density north of Loop 1604." One extra lane each way and overpasses were projected to handle the future growth through 2030 in the original plan for 281 improvements that were supposed to be built in 2003.

**Alternative #2 - Expressway plan -** This is almost identical to the original FREEway expansion plan for 281 that has been promised to the public since hearings in 2001. However, there is a still a big difference in footprint and cost between a tolled and non-tolled scenario. The original plan had two extra main lanes (one in each direction) and four lanes of access roads (2 on each side). The access roads were only where needed, not continuous. In a tolled scenario, there would have to be up to 6 lanes of access roads AND continuous frontage

roads for the whole 8 miles to the county line in order to convert an existing freeway into a toll road.

So I would like to see the non-toll scenario for this alternative explore a reduced footprint to shed cost and have less adverse environmental impacts than the tolled scenario necessitates.

Alternative #3 - Elevated expressway plan - This option has so many adverse impacts it's hard to recommend it to advance to the next level for study. Elevated roadways bring deafening noise levels, extremely high construction costs, aesthetic and safety issues (some due to such limited access which inhibits emergency vehicles getting access to accidents victims, etc. and others due to the possibility of high speed elevated cars crashing onto the roadways and neighborhoods below). This option is also easily tolled and makes getting on and off difficult due to extremely limited access.

#### Managed lanes

"Managed lanes" is code for "toll lanes" where the government "manages" (rather, manipulates) the flow of traffic by limiting access through taxation. It can also choose a method of tolling that determines how many cars can access the toll lanes. Using variable or congestion tolls, the RMA will kick cars off the lanes by jacking-up the toll rates in real time if the traffic on the new lanes slows too much. The toll varies based on the time of day you use the road. So if you have to use the toll lanes during peak hours when everyone has to go to work, you'll pay a premium tax. This is known as "congestion tolling" that they call "congestion pricing." This so called "user fee" is a government imposed new tax for driving our publicly-funded roads. In several proposed scenarios on 281, the tax will be imposed on existing right-of-way already paid for, a DOUBLE TAX!

 COMMENTS END

US281EIS Comment 53

From: Terri Hall [terri@texasturf.org] Sent: Mon 5/10/2010 3:06 PM

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: Please acknowledge receipt

Attachments:

Please acknowledge receipt of our written comments.

# Public Comments for 3rd Public Hearing on US 281 EIS

Submitted by:
Terri Hall on behalf of
Texans Uniting for Reform and Freedom & the San Antonio Toll Party
18866 Stone Oak Pkwy., Ste 103-37
San Antonio, TX 78258
(210) 275-0640
www.TexasTURF.org / www.SATollParty.com

The alternatives presented relied upon vague generalities rather than specifics. While we acknowledge, each alternative is in the beginning stages of development, the public lacked the information needed in order to properly weigh the various options. Without construction cost estimates, construction timelines, estimated proposed toll rates (and how many lanes would be tolled versus not tolled), entrances and egresses (in both tolled and non-tolled scenarios), or proposed sources of funding, the public found it hard to give feedback on the options and certainly made it difficult to determine the potential preferred alternative. It's like trying to hit a target in the dark.

Also, the validity of the data presented for each alternative is questionable and runs afoul of other data. For instance, the RMA claimed the average travel speed on US 281 in peak traffic is 25 MPH and that the average speed 30 years from now after building overpasses and two new lanes (one in each direction) on US 281 would yield a net loss in travel speed to 20 MPH. Yet, in its "expressway" alternative, that also had overpasses and two new lanes, it claims the average speed in peak traffic would be 45 MPH.

The Metropolitan Planning Organization-approved (MPO) original freeway improvement plan for US 281 north of Loop 1604 (in the MPO's TIP from 1999 to mid-2004 that previously had NEPA hearings and public support) demonstrated two new lanes and overpasses would handle the future anticipated growth for the US 281 corridor. But now the single RMA alternative that CANNOT be tolled is basically construed to be inadequate to handle the "growth."

Then, the RMA's data shows that only 25,000 less cars would use a tolled expressway (185,000) as compared to a freeway (210,000) or roughly a 12% difference. When its own traffic and revenue studies previously showed 35-40% of cars would NOT take the tolled expressway but would have to use the non-toll access roads, these figures are questionable at best. Even more suspect is its claim 86% of the traffic would take managed toll lanes versus a free expressway. When most managed lane projects around the state are doing good to see 8% of the traffic pay to use managed lanes, the differences between the RMA's projections and the reality are staggering.

Most all projected traffic on toll roads are based on what amounts to speculation. No one knows what economic factors will change in 30 years. No one knows how travel patterns, employment patterns, development patterns, etc. will change in the next 30 years. Even based on what we do know, the new version of tolling (tolling existing freeways/rights of way) are vastly underutilized due to high toll rates, resistance to tolling, and availability of adjacent free expressway lanes. Also, few of these toll projects are self-sustaining (most need massive public subsidies, including our gas tax money, so whether you take the toll roads or not, we're all paying for them which is a DOUBLE TAX and unnecessary tax burden) and have no business being built.

Given the data presented, the RMA skewed the potential feedback to favor its preferred alternative, the expressway option, over the other alternatives. Since there may be non-toll sources of funding for a smaller footprint versus a larger one, since costs to commuters in tolled versus non-tolled scenarios vary greatly therefore impacts vary greatly, and since the least invasive alternative has fewer potential adverse environmental impacts because this project traverses the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, the sole source of drinking water for a city of nearly 2 million, cost is an enormous factor in determining the preferred alternative and no such information was presented. Such factors need to be considered before determining the preferred alternative. It is our understanding that the preferred alternative will already be identified in the DEIS by the next round of hearings without the public ever having the opportunity to weigh any meaningful information about the various alternatives (including meaningful information about both tolled and non-tolled scenarios for each alternative).

The overpass/expansion alternative utilizes traffic management techniques new to many Texans and has the potential to

meet the purpose and need with less cost to commuters (no toll taxes) and less damage to the environment. Proper explanation of these new methods is key to educating the public about this alternative. Not only was that not done, the facilitator in my small group actually spoke negatively multiple times about alternative #1 when the public feedback had been generally positive. The facilitator said more stop lights could plague the freeway in the future under this alternative.

However, there are other ways for this alternative to upgrade US 281 to a controlled access highway without continuous access roads and the expense of access rights (ie - give access through backage or arterial connections). How the final proposed alternative #1 (overpass/expansion alternative) gets developed may torpedo a great solution if the most affordable/workable options for how to implement it aren't advanced. For instance, buying up access rights may cause the cost to skyrocket when backage or arterial road solutions could be much more affordable and make this a potential preferred alternative.

Expressway alternative #2 needs to explore continuous versus discontinuous access roads (and analyze/present cost info for each). Under a non-tolled scenario, continuous access roads are not required as they are under state law for a tolled scenario. Also, a tolled alternative cannot meet the purpose and need since it doesn't ultimately solve the congestion problem on US 281 (which also means it will fail to address air quality/non-attainment issues). It simply displaces the traffic to access roads and neighborhood streets, making neighborhoods less safe and adversely effecting property values and quality of life. Non-compete agreements also ensure congestion remains on free routes, so this again makes a tolled scenario fail to meet the purpose and need of the project.

#### CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

The information in this email and the documents accompanying it contain confidential information belonging to the sender which is legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the individuals or entities named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify us by telephone or email.

You replied on 5/11/2010 8:45 AM.

#### US281EIS

dmsavage@hotmail.com [dmsavage@hotmail.com] Sent: Mon 5/10/2010 7:21 PM From:

US281EIS To:

Cc:

Subject: how best to improve mobility along the stretch of US 281 from 1604 to Borgfeld Road

Attachments:

Consider UNDERPASSES at Encino Rio, Evans, and Stone Oak with possibility of constructing more further north. Through traffic could travel unimpeded on the underpasses in either 6 or 8 lanes, depending on traffic modeling with realistic future loads. Access road would be at grade and would be two lanes on each side of the highway.

DO NOT FUND THIS PROJECT WITH TOLLS. Demand that Texas gas taxes go 100% towards TXDOT and recoup losses going ten years back. If you can't do that, then you need to disband the Alamo RMA, because you are simply a money pit and are of no use to the citizens of San Antonio. We have paid you too much for you to turn around and tax us some more.

David Savage

Sent: Mon 5/10/2010 9:38 PM

You replied on 5/11/2010 8:51 AM.

### US281EIS

From: Jennifer Sturm [ajmmms@gmail.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: roads

Attachments:

Hello there,

Just want to add my comment on tolls. Please consider a non toll plan. My family cant afford much, and tolls would strap us for gas, food money and such....

Regards,

JS

Sent: Mon 5/10/2010 10:02 PM

🚺 You forwarded this message on 5/11/2010 4:11 PM.

#### US281EIS

From: Forrest [Patriot@satx.rr.com]

To: US281EIS

Cc:

Subject: 281 Attachments:

We do NOT want tolls on 281! A toll road will NOT solve congestion or adequately handle future growth, it will only push the congestion to the access roads and neighborhood streets, making our roads less safe and doing NOTHING to address air quality. Therefore the alternative doesn't meet the purpose and need of the project.

We constantly hear that there will be a choice: "You can pay and drive on the toll road or you can drive on the 'free' lanes". Well the 'free' lanes turn out to be the frontage roads and that wouldn't be any different than what we currently have. I don't think any of you take the frontage road when driving from say I-35 and 1604 to Rittiman do you? Of course not, then call the free lanes what they are-Frontage Roads-why try to disguise or spin it except that you know if you called the 'free' lanes frontage roads you would have more backlash from the casual uninformed citizen.

Thank you for your time, Forrest Byas 1226 Phantom Valley San Antonio,TX 78232

Commen	ts submitted vi	ia Project We	ebsite	



REFERENCE#	DATE/TIME ENTERED	Salutation	FNAME	LNAME	MAILING_ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	EMAIL	PHONE	COMMENTS
57	56:51.0	Mr.	Nico	de Greef	22315 Covella Ct	San Antonio	тх	78259	degreefnico@yahoo.com		Please no tolls! With all the growth in this area and all the added taxes, there should be funds to construct additional roads and overpasses - just like is done in the rest of San Antonio where there are no tolls. It is illegal to use a portion of the existing public road, and especially its right-of-way that was already approved and funded in previous years for an expanded Hwy 281 for a toll road. The traffic flow in the entire North Central SA area should be considered, including expansion of 281, but also Loop 1604, Bulverde Road, Evans Road, etc. Immediately improve the intersection of 281 and Evans at the Eastern side - add a lane to turn South from Evans onto 281.
58	08:02.0	Mr.	Bob	Haag	2055 Adobe Trail	San Antonio	тх	78232	bobhaag@sbcglobal.net		The intersections on 281 N, that have stop lights, should have the left turn lights on at the same time to cut down on light time on 281. That was the way it was 10 years ago before the infamous RMA got involved. This super-street is just a stall to get to 2012 (and defer costs that toll roads would cost to bring down there cost numbers)and the Austin beauracats get another chance to promote toll roads, which is what RMA is interested in. I wish you would for the commuter instead of servicing the politicians.
59	53:52.0	Mr.	Bob	Barnes	7330 san pedro	San Antonio	TX	78216	bbarnes@reatares.com		Any serious consideration to eliminate access or frontage roads is seriously shortsighted and an affront to all of the planning existing taxpayers and stkeholders along 281 have made while waiting for the powers that be to deliver on their responsibility to provide SAFE and effective roads and highways. We have paid gas taxes for years. What and who has spent this money on things other than our roads. If all you are doing is trying to get people from point A to B, without creating access to all of the properties and taxpayers in the affected area, just put in a train track. Thanks
60	55:25.0	Mr.	James	Thompson	2734 Montebello	San Antonio	TX	78259-2161	jet1799@swbell.net	210-497-5556	l am opposed to toll roads on highways 281 and 1604. I am in favor of overpasses or other options that don't include tolling the motorist.
61	56:35.0		Jean	Heide	3126 Manila	San Antonio	TX	78217	hi-d-ho@sbcglobal.net	210-655-5783	I do not believe in toll roads. Especially 281. I find this to be a form of discrimination as I do not have to pay a toll to drive to my home as the residents along 281 will have to. I would rather support a dedicated tax on gasoline to be used strictly and only for our roads.
62	24:45.0	Mr.	David	Drewa	21406 Encino Lookout	San Antonio	тх	78259-2656	david@drewadesigns.com	210 481 5335	I'm unable to attend the meeting tonight, but I just spent some time looking through all the PDFs and presentation documents. To me, it's clear that the (non-elevated) Expressway option will meet most needs (traffic speed, traffic capacity, access to businesses and side streets, efficient interchanges, plenty of entrance and exit ramps) and has fewer negatives (lower profile, less noise, etc.) than the other options. Regarding funding, obviously a non-toll version of the Expressway option would be ideal. But if that would delay construction significantly, I would fully support managed or toll options to get this project started ASAP. Thank you.
63	22:37.0	Ms.	Rosalinda`	Helwig	727 Mesa Ridge	San Antonio	TX	78258	cuinsa@sbcglobal.net		I, too, feel that, we, citizens/taxpapers are never listened to. I suggest the overpasses be put into place "IMMEDIATELY" rather than the "Superstreets", this will keep 281N flowing without snags of Red Lights. It is good for the Environment because it keeps the cars moving rather than ideling wasting gas and giving off fumes, not to mention that some cars leak oil over our Edwards Aquifer.
64	15:24.0	Mr.	Richard	Edwards	24365 Wilderness Oak	San Antonio	тх	78258	redwards@lonestar-auto.com	210-249-7500	Be it understood that I favor all options for the 281 project be NON-TOLLED. Tolling the 281 corridor in any manner or capacity will abridge my right to travel and place an undue burden on my finances. I would rather suffer the congestion caused by poor city planning (at the behest of commercial interests) than to suffer further injury and indignation by the city, county, state and its agents so that these same entities may further profit at public expense.
65	28:49.0	Ms.	Marlene	Hudnall	2235 Estate View Dr	San Antonio	Тх	78260	mhudnall@satx.rr.com	830-980-2753	I was at the meeting on the 29th. You had a lot of nice maps & pictures all great but that was a big expense. Overpasses should have been built yrs ago when the money was alloted, but was spent no one knows where. By waiting some business were allowed to build & now we have to pay to remove them. The smart street project is just a big waist of \$6 mill. which could have been put to overpasses. All these meetings & brochures etc. plus people to man these meeting are a big expense that could have been used towards the road. Toll rds are out NO. No elevated hwy either, as this would really effect the local business. Also need 281 & 1604 fixed. Was told at the meeting that yrs ago the engineers said their would not be much growth No. of 1604. Well here we are. Also was told at the meeting that the projections till 2035 the growth would not be that great either. Who ever comes up with this needs to live out this way for awhile &ck. the growth & land still availible. Don't know the hang up for overpasses. 410,37and any major hwy all have overpasses which makes alot of since.
66	49:32.0		Sasha	Kodet	4442 Putting Green	San Antonio	тх	78217	sashacross@hotmail.com		Although I think that construction in this area will cause considerable inconvenience, I believe that overpasses should be built to alleviate the current traffic issues that have arisen with the overdevelopment of the 281N corridor and surrounding areas. (Besides, how can you have stoplights on an interstate highway!?!)
67	05:23.0	Mr.	Steven	Parks	26922 Sparrow Ridge	San Antonio	Texas	78261	steven@parks.net	210-259-3023	I think people pay enough taxes that toll roads shouldn't be considered for 281. I personally prefer alternative #1, the overpass expansion plan. Overpasses and an extra lane in each direction would significantly cut traffic without the need to charge rediculous toll fees on already paid for roads.



Meeting Evalu	ation Formg		





How did you hear abo	out tonight's	meeting? (chec	k all that apply)					
411on281.com			Church l	Church bulletin				
Sign placed in US	S 281 the pro	ject corridor	Friend/fa	mily/word o	f mouth	_Facebook		
Twitter			Socialize					
Newspaper (which or	ne?)		Radio (which station?)					
TV (which station?) _	Chaux	el 4 neus	✓ Email (from v	vhom?)				
Other:		in the						
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	ate the locati	on for tonight's	meeting?					
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked	- 8	Much			
_	1	2	3	(4)	5	V		
Comments:	14		- J. 17	2 11 6		141 3 JA 1. E 1		
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	ate the inform	nation presente	d and on display	?				
	Not		Somewhat		Very			
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful			
	1	2	3	(4)	5	90		
	2 - 4-5							
Comments:			y	Page 1		5.00		
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	ate the small	group work for	mat used for ton	ight's meetin	g? NA			
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Much			
_	1	2	3	4	5			
Comments:					N R	Aug.		
Any other comments	? (Please use	additional shee	ts if needed.)		Com	ment 68		
sthe som	e for	the	1604/8ea	World	/157 ar	ea. Why		
s everyne	wastin	g mone	y or ~	roug	roads u	when we		
		syste	-					
		/ /						



How did you hear	r about tonight's meet	ing? (che	ck all that apply)				
411on281.co	m		Church bulle		HOA/NA bulletin		
Sign placed i	n US 281 the project o	orridor	Friend/family/word of mouth			_Facebook	
Twitter			Socializer				
Newspaper (whic	h one?)		Radio (which station?)				
TV (which station	n?)		Email (from who	m?)	2		
Other:							
On a scale of 1 to	5, rate the location fo	r tonight'	s meeting?				
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very		
	Like		Liked		Much		
	1	2	3	4	(5)	-	
Comments:	real Location	nl					
	5, rate the informatio	n present	ed and on display?		A		
	Not		Somewhat		Very		
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful		
	1	2	3	4	(5)	-	
Comments:	isplays we	ere d	outs tranding	`	2 2 5 2 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7		
On a scale of 1 to	5, rate the small grou	p work fo	rmat used for tonight	's mee	ting?		
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very		
	Like		Liked		Much	_ NA	
	1	2	3	4	5	_ (~/`	
Comments:	eidn't stry	for N	neeting			Comment 69	
Any other comme	ents? (Please use addit	ional she	ets if needed.)				
w							
	100000000000000000000000000000000000000		- 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10			2002	

How did you hear abo	out tonight's me	eting? (che	ck all that apply)				
411on281.com			Church bulletinHOA/NA bulletinFriend/family/word of mouthFacebookSocializer				
Sign placed in US	S 281 the project	corridor					
Twitter							
Newspaper (which or	ie?)		Radio (which	station?) _		4 3 3 4 4 4	
TV (which station?) _	- 124		Email (from w	hom?)			
Other:	= "7   SE) (*					Control of	
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	ate the location i	for tonight'	s meeting?				
	Did Not		Somewhat	8 8	Liked Very		
	Like	4	Liked		Much		
7 14 2 4 - 2	<b>1</b> ( *4) (*	2	3	4	(5)	Charles (	
Comments:		Sa ,	A 10		37 6		
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	ite the informati	on present	ed and on display?	)			
	Not	_	Somewhat	2 1 1 3	Very	3	
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful		
_	1	2	3	4	(5)		
C							
Comments:	1 .11	1.0	1.0	1.3			
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	Did Not	up work to	rmat used for toni	gnt s meeti	•		
					Liked Very	Take #	
_	Like	2	Liked		Much	_	
	1	2	3	4	(5)		
Comments:					*(		
Any other comments	? (Please use add	itional shee	ets if needed.)				
				****		-41	
						***	

How did you hear	about tonight's mee	ting? (chec	k all that apply)				
411on281.com	n = ,, , , , ,		Church bulletinHOA/NA bulletinFriend/family/word of mouthFacebookSocializer Radio (which station?)Email (from whom?)				
Sign placed in	US 281 the project	corridor					
Twitter							
Newspaper (which	one?)						
	?)						
Other:/	F		-4, 5				
On a scale of 1 to 5	, rate the location f	or tonight's	meeting?				
Did Not			Somewhat		Liked Very		
	Like		Liked		Much		
	1	2	3	4	(5)		
Comments:						<del> </del>	
On a scale of 1 to 5	, rate the informati	on presente	ed and on display?				
	Not		Somewhat		Very		
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful		
	1	2	3	4	5		
Comments:							
On a scale of 1 to 5	, rate the small gro	up work for	rmat used for tonig	ght's meeti	ng?		
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very		
	Like		Liked		Much	9.	
	- 1.1.	,2	3	4	5		
Comments:			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Any other commen	nts? (Please use add	itional shee	ets if needed.)				
(CIECUS II	1	***		all 25 - 27 - 25			
, W	W. A.						



How did you hear about tonight's meeting? (ch	eck all that apply)		
411on281.com	Church bull	etin _	HOA/NA bulletin
Sign placed in US 281 the project corridor	Friend/famil	y/word of mouth _	Facebook
Twitter	Socializer		
Newspaper (which one?)	Radio (which stat	ion?)	
TV (which station?)	Email (from who	m?)	
Other:			
On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the location for tonigh	t's meeting?		
Did Not	Somewhat	Liked Ve	ery
Like	Liked	Much	)
1 2	3	4 5	
Comments: FXCEPT/No idea	where it a	Das No sig	ns big enough
On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the information presen	nted and on display?	1 tookling	3 Cocatodys
Not	Somewhat	Very	
Helpful	/ Helpful	Helpfu	1
1 2	3	4 5	····
Comments: Vague/as to projected	cost/told	3-15 VIS 6	fore maybe
On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the small group work i	format used for tonight	's meeting?	pleto
Did Not	Somewhat	Liked Ve	
Like	Liked	Much	
1 2	3	4 5	<del></del>
Comments: Great		- Control of the Cont	
Any other comments? (Please use additional sh	eets if needed.)		Comment 70
Presenters were o	pen-mindo	D ton-	tg5/2
	V	- Control of the Cont	



How did you hear	about tonight's m	neeting? (chec	k all that apply)				
411on281.com	ı Ţ		Church bulletinHOA/NA bulletinFriend/family/word of mouthFacebookSocializer Radio (which station?)				
Sign placed in	US 281 the proje	ct corridor					
Twitter							
Newspaper (which	one?)						
TV (which station?	")		Email (from wh	nom?)			
Other:							
On a scale of 1 to 5	, rate the location	n for tonight's	meeting?				
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very		
	Like	95	Liked		Much		
	1	2	3	4	(5)		
Comments:	n h						
On a scale of 1 to 5	, rate the inform	ation presente	ed and on display?				
	Not		Somewhat		Very		
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful		
	1	2_	3	4	5		
Comments:	w		<u> </u>				
On a scale of 1 to 5		roup work for	mat used for tonig	ht's meeti	ng?		
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very		
	Like		Liked		Much		
	1	2	3	4	5		
Comments:							
Any other commen	nts? (Please use ac	lditional shee	ets if needed.)				



How did you hear a	about tonight's me	eting? (chec	k all that apply)					
411on281.com			Church bulletinHOA/NA bulletin					
Sign placed in	US 281 the project	corridor	Friend/family/word of mouthFacebookSocializer  Radio (which station?)					
Twitter								
Newspaper (which	one?)							
TV (which station?)	)		Email (from w	vhom?)				
Other:	Other:							
On a scale of 1 to 5,	, rate the location f	for tonight's	meeting?					
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Much			
	1	2	3	4	(5)	_		
Comments:								
On a scale of 1 to 5,	, rate the informati	ion presente	d and on display	?				
	Not		Somewhat		Very			
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful			
	1	2	3	(4)	5			
Comments:								
On a scale of 1 to 5,	, rate the small gro	up work for	mat used for ton	ight's meetin <sub>i</sub>	g?			
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Much			
	1	2	3	4 -	(5)	1.00		
Comments:								
Any other commen	its? (Please use add	itional shee	ts if needed.)					
			on Address.					
			The state of the s	18-81				



How did you hear	about tonight's mee	eting? (che	ck all that apply)					
411on281.com	n		Church bulletinHOA/NA bulletinFriend/family/word of mouthFacebookSocializer Radio (which station?)					
Sign placed in	US 281 the project	corridor						
Twitter								
Newspaper (which	one?)							
TV (which station	?)		Email (from who	om?)				
Other:								
On a scale of 1 to 5	, rate the location f	or tonight'	s meeting?					
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Much			
	1	2	3	4	(5)			
Comments:	_	7 2 1	54 Pt 13	red.	C			
On a scale of 1 to 5	5, rate the informati	on present	ed and on display?					
	Not		Somewhat		Very			
	Helpful	y - V	Helpful	e4. 1	Helpful			
	1	2	3	4	5			
Comments:								
On a scale of 1 to !	o, rate the small grow	up work fo	rmat used for tonigh	nt's meetii	ng?			
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Much			
	1	2	3	4	5)			
Comments:	acilipton/s	ules	reded but	tu"C	udmer sei	viee 1		
Any other comme	nts? (Please use add	itional she	ets if needed.)		Training	-		
2 tacile	Jamo desa	greed	n constru	ution	timing,	Comment 71		
		0		,	- 1577 , 12			



How did you hear about tonight's meeting? (c.	heck all that apply)			
411on281.com	Church bu	Church bulletin		
Sign placed in US 281 the project corridor	rFriend/fam	aily/word of mouth	Facebook	
Twitter	Socializer			
Newspaper (which one?)	Radio (which st	ation?)		
TV (which station?)	Email (from wh	nom?)		
Other:	and the same of th			
On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the location for tonig	ht's meeting?	· James Carlotte		
Did Not	Somewhat	Liked Ve	ery	
· Sail tame de Like	Liked	Much	Cash all with	
ر در المنظم ا	3 ,550	4 (5-	Ja Karanikisi	
Comments:	**			
On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the information prese	ented and on display?	S	Drawbanka di	
Not	Somewhat	Very	and a	
Helpful	Helpful	Helpfu	NE COUNTING	
	3 ************************************	138 VELLET (15)	Hiduse ge	
Comments:	4 17. 12 2. 13 11.	Walled Street	Book at fall	
On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the small group work	format used for tonig	ht's meeting?		
Did Not	Somewhat	Liked Ve	ery	
Like	Liked	Much	7 Land	
1 2	3	, 1 5 5	1367)	
Comments:				
Any other comments? (Please use additional si	heets if needed.)		ggen 2 - Anna Guille Ving (1966)	
22				



How did you hear	r about tonight's m	eeting? (chec	k all that apply)						
411on281.com			Church bu		HOA/NA bulletin				
Sign placed i	Sign placed in US 281 the project corridor			Friend/family/word of mouth					
Twitter			Socializer						
Newspaper (whic	h one?)		Radio (which station?)						
TV (which station	n?)		Email (from w	Email (from whom?)					
Other:									
On a scale of 1 to	5, rate the location	for tonight's	meeting?						
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very				
	Like		Liked		Much				
	1	2	3	4	<b>5</b>	_			
Comments:				<u> </u>					
On a scale of 1 to	5, rate the informa	tion presente	d and on display?						
	Not		Somewhat		Very				
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful				
	1	2	3	4	(5)				
Comments:									
On a scale of 1 to	5, rate the small gr	oup work for	mat used for tonig	ght's meeti	ng?				
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very				
	Like		Liked		Much				
	1	2	3	4	5	_			
Comments:	Did not Litters								
Any other comme	ents? (Please use ad	ditional shee	ts if needed.)						
- MM HIP 6									
			T. T. 12	11					
			-1-						



How did you hear ab	out tonight's m	eeting? (chec	k all that apply)					
411on281.com			Church bulletinHOA/NA b					
Sign placed in US 281 the project corridor Twitter			Friend/family/word of mouthFacebook					
			Socializer	v				
Newspaper (which or	ne?)		Radio (which station?)  Email (from whom?)  Oh					
TV (which station?)	1							
Other:	- Commenced	911/	NOW) NO	Me	S the syl	11 1		
On a scale of 1 to 5, r			meeting?					
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Much			
_	1	2	3	4	(5)			
Comments:						·		
On a scale of 1 to 5, r	ate the informa	tion presente	d and on display?	•				
	Not		Somewhat		Very			
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful			
_	1	2	3	4	(5)			
Comments:								
On a scale of 1 to 5, r	ate the small gr	oup work for	mat used for toni	ght's meetir	ng?			
	Did Not		Somewhat	1	Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Liked Very	JCI		
USST XTE	sendent.	402°	3	6.4NV	+ 61, 15 NES)	15 - 1		
Comments: Dy d	tan	atter				1		
Any other comments	s? (Please use ad	ditional shee	ts if needed.)	10000	) JPS gar	Da.		
				Carret				
						SEN SEN		
	Ī					- ,		



How did you hear	about tonight's me	eeting? (chec	k all that apply)					
411on281.comSign placed in US 281 the project corridorTwitter			Church b		HOA/NA bulletin			
			Friend/fa	of mouth	Facebook			
			Socializer					
Newspaper (which	n one?)		Radio (which station?) Email (from whom?)					
TV (which station	?)							
Other:								
On a scale of 1 to !	5, rate the location	for tonight's	meeting?					
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Much			
	1	2	3	4	5	-		
Comments:								
On a scale of 1 to !	5, rate the informat	tion presente	ed and on display?	•				
	Not		Somewhat		Very			
	Helpful		Helpful	- 0	Helpful			
	1	2	3	4	5			
Comments:								
On a scale of 1 to !	5, rate the small gro	oup work for	mat used for toni	ght's meetir	ng?			
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked		Much	_		
	1	2	(3)	4	5			
Comments:								
Any other comme	nts? (Please use ad	ditional shee	ts if needed.)					
				U				
MD/22						100		



How did you hear abo	out tonight's m	eeting? (che						
411on281.com			Church bu	_HOA/NA bulletin				
Sign placed in US	S 281 the proje	ct corridor	Friend/far	of mouth	_Facebook			
Twitter	Twitter			Socializer				
Newspaper (which on			Radio (which station?)					
IV (which station?) _	KSAT 12	34	Email (from w	Email (from whom?)				
Other:	griff Rami	1 4317	-35					
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	ate the location	n for tonight	's meeting?		Ser and			
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like	i i but	Liked		Much	ALL 900 - 1		
	1	2	3	4	5			
Comments:	-27 -7	V.	The street	<u> </u>				
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	ate the informa	ation present	ted and on display?	l. Al sense		\		
	Not		Somewhat		Very			
a to great the	Helpful	Section 1	Helpful		Helpful			
34 AN 35	1 1	2	lasel <sup>3</sup>	4	(5)	e de la companya de l		
Comments:	040							
On a scale of 1 to 5, ra	ate the small g	roup work fo	ormat used for tonig	ght's meeti	ng?			
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very			
	Like		Liked	~	Much			
16 <sub>3</sub> a 1 85°	1	2	3	4	5	1248		
Comments:								
Any other comments?	? (Please use ac	dditional she	ets if needed.)		Co	omment 72		
Most pe	sale s	rem /	none concu	med	about th	e toll iesu		
as oppos						re info en		
how to im	pact th	110+ w	dicision	the de	of neede	d to make		
a better			Public Meeting #3		0	and Malling in		



How did you hear	about tonight's n	neemilg: (cueci	can macappiy)	)			
411on281.comSign placed in US 281 the project corridor			Church		HOA/NA bulletin Facebook		
			Friend/	mouth			
Twitter			Socializ				
Newspaper (which	one?)		Radio (which station?)				
TV (which station?	")		Email (from	whom?)			
Other:							
On a scale of 1 to 5	, rate the locatio	n for tonight's	meeting?				
	Did Not		Somewhat		Liked Very		
	Like		Liked		Much	_	
	1	2	3	4	5		
Comments:							
On a scale of 1 to 5		ation presented	d and on displa	y?			
	Not		Somewhat		Very		
	Helpful		Helpful		Helpful		
	1	2	3	4	5	800	
Comments:							
On a scale of 1 to 5	, rate the small g	roup work for	mat used for to	night's meeting	g?		
	Did Not	•	Somewhat		Liked Very		
	Like		Liked		Much		
	1	2	3	4	5	<del></del>	
Comments:							
Any other commer			s if needed )				
iny outer commer	ito. (i icase ase a	damonar sneet	s in necueu.,				

**APPENDIX G Court Reporter Transcript of Public Meeting** 



3RD PUBLIC MEETING FOR U.S. 281
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

APRIL 29, 2010

SUMMIT CHRISTIAN CENTER

2575 Marshall Road

San Antonio, Texas 78259

1	INDEX
2	ORAL COMMENTS GIVEN BY: PATRICK MARRON
3	MARILYN GARCIA
4	ANONYMOUS
5	SID OGDEN
6	HOWARD GOINGS
7	LESTER PALLISER
8	AL HANAK
9	MICHAEL MAURER, SR.
10	
11	PRESENTATION GIVEN BY: MICHAEL SEXTON
12	STEPHANIE MESSERLI
13	
14	SMALL-GROUP WORK SESSION INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN BY:
15	LINDA XIMENES
16	
17	ORAL COMMENTS GIVEN BY: RICHARD HOOVER
18	SCOTT MERZ
19	RUSSELL SEGUIN
20	JORGE GARCIA
21	DEBORAH M. WALL
22	
23	REPORTS GIVEN BY SMALL-GROUP REPRESENTATIVES
24	
25	ORAL COMMENT GIVEN BY: LLOYD BYTER

everyday, every day of the week at least once, and traffic is becoming very difficult to navigate. It's becoming very, very congestive on this road and I highly recommend -- I highly recommend an elevated expressway for the future and I recommend that we get on this as soon as possible before the traffic doubles or triples in the next few years. That's all I have to say. Hope that's clear. Thank you.

a disconnect between what we see is happening and what we're told is happening like about the money because we -- whether the funds are there or not, we don't know. We see construction all around town everywhere, big huge projects like the 281-410 interchange, the Bandera Road elevated highways and, you know, the 410 improvements, which are great. We all need those. But this is just as important, too, and probably more important than Bandera elevated highway. And we're told that there is funds for every other project everywhere else except here and it just doesn't make sense to us.

We don't want a toll road. We want the -- we want an extension of the expressway that already exists. It just makes sense for all of the businesses out here, for the growth, now with the huge monster -- you know, the golf course out here. I'm sure that they're probably reconsidering their choice of building sites because of this. And we just want it.

And it almost appears -- Our perception is that this is almost a vendetta now because it's like the powers that be, the ones that do the voting, it's like they have made up their mind already. That's our perception. And that they're going -- they want a toll road no matter what because we've caused so much trouble for them that they've

decided they're going to make us suffer. And it's like a standoff that we're going to see who suffers more.

So until Thornton is willing to put a toll road in front of his house and -- not just him, but everybody else that is going to be voting on this decision, until they're willing to do it first, I just have no faith in them.

Comment 75 (Anonymous) I just want to know why SPEAKER: that they are not using the overpasses when the money was appropriated for that and not used the way they're doing. It's going to be a waste of time because if you have to go up and turn around and come back, it's going to be a waste of time and I feel there's no reasons. It would be much, much cheaper to use the overpasses instead of what they're proposing.

Comment 76 SPEAKER: (Sid Ogden) I've looked at the three alternatives. I like number 1 because it says no toll. Number 2 or number 3 would be acceptable, but no toll. I don't like the idea of a toll. We've paid enough taxes, gas taxes, license plates, other things. A toll isn't justified.

lived in Timberwood Park for 17 years and my comments are that I like your proposition number 1. However, in the meantime, I think it'd be wise if you would put three lanes on each side beginning at Borgfeld Road down to Stone Oak.

And if you did that, you know, right away, you've got plenty of room to do that and it could be done. It'd relieve the traffic in the meantime until you start all this.

And one other suggestion I have is when you're over going north and you hit the Borgfeld Road light, if you would put one lane all the way through, people would not have to park and you could put those pegs up so you could go all the way north past Borgfeld to Bulverde. That's all.

SPEAKER: (Lester Palliser) My general Comment 78 comment, and make it all caps, NO TOLLS. NO MANAGED LANES. Nein, n-e-i-n, nyet, n-y-e-t, no. Keep it nontolled! Exclamation point. That's what he says.

Comment 79 SPEAKER: (Al Hanak) My comments are that Highway 281 does not need to be a toll road of any kind. I believe that by building overpasses and easement, you know, lanes where people can get off and remove all the stop lights that are in place currently like at Evans and Stone Oak, then the flow of traffic will be smooth and get through much quicker.

I think option number 1 that is a nontoll is better than 2 or 3 mwhich would be managed or tolled. I think HOV lanes are good because that allows people to travel with numerous -- like buses, cars with numerous people, to use that. I think that's important.

I think that they need to have longer exit lanes for turning left or right because short ones create bottlenecks.

I firmly believe that there's money for all the roads available, that they don't need to issue bonds to pay for the roads because if you want a toll road, you got to have bonds and who's going to pay for it if it goes bankrupt? The taxpayer. We're paying for it already, for the road, with our gasoline taxes and our taxes. So we don't need another tax. And poor people can't afford a toll road anyhow. So very few people would use the toll roads.

I think, overall, the elevated access ramps like at 410 where you can get on east or west could be done to 1604 the same way so that there's not those bottlenecks trying to go

onto 1604 because of the red lights. If you had the overpasses there, then they can get exiting into those traffic lanes much more easily.

So I'm against toll roads. I know a lot of people that are in our subdivision and have expressed the same opinion, that the toll roads are not needed. That all we have to do is build the roadways with overpasses. So I believe that, you know, the people should need -- need to be allowed to vote on what they want and that has never been brought forward. And if they would, they would find out more about what people feel what they want. But I know that of the people that I've talked to, they're against it. Thank you very much.

in Comal County off of Highway 46 West. I'm looking at the -- I'm here at the Public Meeting Number 3, U.S. 281 Environmental Impact Statement, and I've looked at the alternatives, Alternative 1, 2 and 3, and I've looked in the brochure that I was given and I looked at the superstreet. To me, the best alternative is Alternative Number 1, the overpasses, to build the overpasses.

Alternate 2 is not a -- to me, not viable because it could be -- too easily be turned into a toll road, managed lane, toll road, and we don't want that. We don't want that here. We didn't ask for it here.

Alternate 3 also toll ways, managed lanes. We didn't ask for that either.

The money was there to build the overpasses and, for some unknown reason, money has been diverted through some means and possibly may not be there anymore, but that's not our fault. That's someone else's fault. And that money needs to be returned to build those overpasses.

The superstreet, on paper, it looks good, but they're adding more stoplights. You know, not only will -- like the Evans, for example. Not only would it be that stoplight there, but there'd also be a stoplight at the turnaround. So there'd be two stoplights on the northbound side and two stoplights on the southbound side. So you're still --

you're adding another stoplight. It may not be as long as the one long stoplight, but combined, it might be just as long.

So there may be an Alternate 4, which would be similar to the superstreet, but instead of making the -- the two-lane turnaround close, put the two-lane turnaround maybe a half mile further and instead of having a stoplight there, build a two-lane turnaround overpass, two-lane turnaround overpass on the southbound side and, likewise, on the northbound side but further away. As depicted in the superstreet, but just further away, half mile further south, half mile further north.

And so where that two-lane overpass makes, like, a big swooping U-turn will then form their own two lanes to head back to the -- the main connector such as Evans or if -- you know, if enough distance is given, you know, to the north and to the south, it could even then swoop back -- those two lanes could then swoop back and then connect to the actual three lanes that are there right now.

Swerve those within half time to then go to the -- to move to the access -- two lanes to the access -- the off ramp in the superstreet design that could then, you know, turn and make that and so where there could just be that stoplight right there at the access road where it meets that in case people want to go through that intersection such as

~

 Evans and head further south on the access, maybe to go to a business or something or to get back on 281 south. And, likewise, going south, put a two-lane overpass to the inside. That way, it's only the -- The overpass is only going over the main travel lanes on the -- on the opposite side of the freeway.

And then if it's further enough to the south, it could also make a sweeping move to where it comes back and to where there's no stoplights at all on the main lanes anymore. There's only one stoplight at each. Say, for instance, on the Evans, it would be only one stoplight in case people want to go through the Evans Road access road intersection, there would be a stoplight right there.

'Cause, otherwise, if you're turning right, there could be a yield sign. And, likewise, on the -- and that would happen on the eastbound side and the westbound side where there's just one stop on each side.

Then the main lanes would just keep on going. There wouldn't be any stoplights because the people -- it would be no crossing right there, just as in the superstreet. There would be no crossing from Evans going across 281. So there would be no need for a stoplight right there 'cause traffic would not get on right there.

Traffic would get on from Evans and someplace they would have to turn right, but no need for a stoplight because

they'll just merge in with the traffic, with the main lanes and just have it swooping enough to where it's -- they have plenty of time to get onto it. So option 4 is a better alternative than option 2 and 3.

Option 1, of course, is just build the overpasses because they had the money and the thievery has to stop. Use the gas tax money for what it's intended to be and that's for the highways. They're not for the special interest groups, not for roadside parks, not for hike-and-bike trails.

They're not to go to Texas A & M research projects, not to go for VIA buses, not to go to Austin transit service. That gas tax money should be built for highways, period. You know, not for hike-and-bike trails, you know, not for curbs, putting in some curb thing or a special bricklaying things in some special district in Houston in Harris County. Use that gas tax money for what it's intended and stop giving it to the schools, too.

Highways. Overpasses. Build it and they will come. Build the overpasses and people will be happy.

Stop misusing those funds and use them for what they're intended because --

And the stoplights on 281 right now, instead of having at Evans -- for example, I've called so many times about that Evans Road stoplight. The westbound -- the westbound side of Evans Road. That's on a timed basis. I go through there

nearly at midnight Monday through Thursday and that light changes to -- back to red after about two or three cars go. After about eight seconds, that automatically turns back because it's on a good sensor, but then, automatically, it goes to the other side even if there's no cars and they get a green light on Evans Road facing and heading eastbound. They get a light for a full 20 seconds. It used to be 30 seconds, but they retimed it to 20 seconds.

If there's no car there, that light should not turn green for Evans Road. Retime that light, redo the sensors in that light where it doesn't give them a green light if nobody's there because this is happening at midnight and people don't want to be stopping here along --

And now -- and now at Encino Rio, same thing is happening there. No car is there at Encino Rio heading -- heading west and getting onto 281 north or south and -- but yet the light will turn green for them. That needs to stop because for years it's been sensored, but now it's -- all of a sudden it's on a timed thing. Maybe it's sensors. Go fix it. People are tired of this, you know.

We're traveling at midnight. There shouldn't be any traffic there. We should be going 50 miles an hour, 55. We shouldn't be coming to a screeching halt. And because TxDOT and the City want to mistime this where people are pissed all times of the day.

There's an example. When I picked up a friend last year from the airport, Friday afternoon, 3:05, I'm heading south on 281. There's hardly any traffic. Traffic is moving heading northbound. I picked my friend up at the airport, we're returning about 5:05 Friday afternoon. It wasn't on any holiday weekend or anything. I'm traveling 55 miles an hour. The traffic --

And I just called a couple nights before about the timing of these stoplights and, apparently, some new person with TxDOT, apparently, went out there and fixed it because at 5:05 on a Friday afternoon, I'm coming through there and I'm not stopping. Traffic is moving 55 miles an hour gorgeously through Encino Rio, through Evans Road, 55 miles an hour, all the way through. It's not until I get stopped at the Stone Oak stoplight, but I'm, like, five cars from the lead and -- but the traffic's not all congested because somebody, with all those complaints I've given about the timing of these lights, I've been -- I guess somebody went out there and fixed it.

I'm sure that they were reprimanded for doing so, were fired for doing so because it never has happened since.

That was on -- at 5:05 p.m. on a Friday afternoon. No congestion. Traffic was moving because the stoplights, for one time, for one day, they were timed right. They can do it again. Thank you. And that's my comment. Do what the

public wants. No toll road.

MS. LINDA XIMENES: Good evening, everybody. It's really good to see everyone here, to have such a nice turnout. We're glad that you were willing to come and see all what we have to do at this point of the process for the Environmental Impact Statement for U.S. 281.

My name is Linda Ximenes, and I'm the facilitator for this evening. I'll be -- am sort of emceeing this process down here and then I'll explain a little bit later what we're going to be doing as we work in small group, discussion groups. I'm going to introduce Terry Brechtel from the Alamo RMA in just a second and she will do a welcome and then we're going to have a short presentation from the EIS team and then it'll come back to me.

I'll explain the process that we're going to use for the discussion groups and then we'll move upstairs and have some discussions around each one of the different alternatives.

So let me turn it over to Terry.

MS. TERRY BRECHTEL: Thank you, Linda. Thank you, everyone. I don't know if I need this, but let me just welcome everyone. Again, this is our third public meeting that we're having on 281 and we have put together tonight, I think, a very unique way of communicating with the community. It's going to give you an opportunity to give us real feedback on what you think about the three alternatives. And that's what you're really here for.

You're here to tell us what you think and that's the way we've set this up. And I'm thrilled that on a Spurs game night, hopefully, the last night that the Spurs will be playing for this round, that you're here. For convenience, we did go into the ESPN website and we've got the website up. So if you're one of those folks that just have to check the score -- I am -- you may be able to do that. Maybe your facilitator will let you do that.

But it is -- it is up there and -- and, again, given that this is such an important corridor and it means so much how you live it and are impacted by it, I'm very glad to have such a turnout on this very important evening. Thank you.

MR. MICHAEL SEXTON: Okay. Strap your seat belts on because we're going to move very fast because we need to get to someone who's going to talk about the most important things. What I need to do, very quickly, is bring everybody up to speed on where we've been since we started this project and how we got to the three alternatives that we're talking about tonight. Stephanie is then going to come up and talk to you about the three alternatives so that we can get to the most important part of tonight, which is your input.

Now, 281 has four goals, four major goals: Address growth, improve safety, improve functionality and enhance the quality of life. Everything that we do has to be

measured against those four goals, but with your help, we've developed a series of objectives that were on that slide that talk about reducing accident rates, reducing travel time and, to the maximum possibility, minimize -- maximizing the use of nontoll funds to build this facility. Next slide.

The alternatives analysis that we've been going through, we already talked, in the November time frame, about the Level 1 analysis where we had a large number of alternatives. We reduced them down from the universe of alternatives we identified with you in September and now, tonight, we're talking about Level 2 and Level 3 analyses and we're reducing the number of alternatives to get down to the number of alternatives we'll carry into the EIS. At the same time, the quality and the quantity of the analysis is increasing as we have fewer alternatives to look at.

Next slide.

Obviously, the corridor stretches from 1604 and includes the connections to and from the north on 1604 all the way up through Borgfeld Road almost to the county line. That's a distance of about eight miles. Now, not only do we impact and does this area of Bexar County impact the project, but so does a large part of Comal County. And so we're considering both in this analysis.

In 1970, there was almost no one living out here. By

2008, we're up to 86,000 and, in the future, what we're calling our forecast year or our planning horizon, we're going to be up at more than 140,000 people living in the study area in Bexar and Comal County. So you can see, here is 1973, we had a total of six developments. Fast forward to 2009, and you can see -- Do we have another slide there? I'm sorry. There we go. You can see, in 2009, lots more development. Some room for additional development to occur. This is, of course, 281. Next slide, please.

On the Level 2 analysis, we looked at each one of the alternatives that were remaining after Alternative 1. We looked at everything from reducing the conflict between local and through traffic to satisfying forecasted travel demand. Next slide.

Out of all of the alternatives that were left, there was one alternative that -- it's a great alternative, streetcar or a light rail. But eight miles of streetcar or light rail that doesn't connect to anything isn't going to be a best investment, especially when VIA's going to probably be starting the same sort of alternative in the downtown area and building out.

But over the next 25 years that we're looking at for this project, they're probably not going to be to the point where they can connect to that eight-mile section. So, in discussions with them, they agree that it makes most sense

\*

q

for us to preserve a right of way for future expansion because we can't keep building highways forever and ever. At some point in time, we've got to have a balanced transportation system and, in the meantime, what can we do to support them in their mission by making it more feasible and more desirable to use buses? Whether it's park-and-ride lots or the ability for buses to get on and off the facility. Next slide, please.

In the Level 3 alternatives, we took the remaining alternatives, based on discussions with you, and we started packaging them. One of the things that we'd heard was that people really have a problem with the existing intersections. There's too much congestion. Why don't you just grade separate those intersections? And so one of the alternatives we call the Overpass Expansion, that is strictly a nontoll alternative, and then we looked at a second alternative, which is the overpass expansion plus realizing that that alternative by itself might not accommodate all future traffic levels, what could we do to the parallel corridors of Blanco and Bulverde to add a little capacity?

And then we looked at two alternatives, the expressway alternative and the elevated expressway, and we've heard the concerns that citizens have about using tolls. And so we're providing -- In all of our analyses, we're providing a

nontolled alternative for the expressway, a tolled alternative and a manage, which is sort of a hybrid of the two. Same thing for the elevated expressway. The elevated expressway, as Stephanie will explain to you, is actually building a second level and trying to minimize conflicts.

Now, all of these alternatives would have what we call complementary elements. Things that won't solve problems by themselves. You can't put buses out here and solve the congestion you have today and you certainly can't do it in 2035. But if you can get a small part of your market over onto those facilities and services, you're better off. We can improve the quality of life with bike and pedestrian facilities. Growth management is something that's incorporated in the MPO forecast that we used and then, of course, various other elements that will be part of the long-range plan. Next slide, please.

This slide is just an attempt to try to explain the lanes that would be used in each of the alternatives that I talked to you about. Today, we have a four- to a six-lane cross section. The green is those lanes that are further out towards Borgfeld Road, and then we pick up an extra lane as we get down toward Loop 1604.

Down here with the elevated section, you see we'll build bridges around the existing lanes on both sides and in between we might have as much as 12 continuous lanes. That

doesn't mean that in one place we might not have an additional lane or two, but, by and large, this is the cross section we're talking about. Next slide.

Managed lanes are something we're going to talk about.

Managed lanes and toll lanes -- Toll lanes, obviously, are

lanes where most vehicles that are not exempted by state

law, which would be buses, would be emergency vehicles such

as fire, police and related vehicles, would have to pay to

use those lanes. There would be, however, by state law,

alternatives to that.

The managed lane is a little bit of a hybrid between the toll lane and the nontolled lane. The managed lane, depending on what policies the government wants to pursue, do they want to try and get more people in fewer cars, well, they might allow people that ride share or van pool to ride for reduced or free price. They might say, you know, we have congestion during peak hours, we're going to charge higher tolls during peak hours and lower tolls in the off-peak period. So if you travel off peak, it's not going to cost you nearly as much and all sorts of combinations and permutations that could be considered there. This is something that's done in Houston today.

Now, the Level 3 evaluation factors -- and I want to set the stage here for Stephanie with this, so next slide. One key concern that we've heard out here is Camp Bullis

R

operations are very important to us. They're a major employer. Please don't mess them up.

And so we looked at all the alternatives -- the no-build overpass expansion, expressway alternatives. We looked at how they would impact Camp Bullis. No-build and the overpass option, no problems. The expressway alternatives, well, yeah, there might be a potential that we would stimulate additional development over against Camp Bullis that might create problems for their operation.

There might be some light intrusion to their night operations that they do as a result of our overhead lighting. And the overpass expansion plus the widening of Blanco, that was the one that we were most concerned about because if you -- we widen Blanco and add more capacity, we'd be having the potential to stimulate more development right over against Camp Bullis. We'd have overhead lighting on Blanco that would have a potential to intrude into Camp Bullis. So that's how we look at those.

Superstreet is under construction. Many of you know about that. Under the no-build alternative -- that's part of the no-build alternative because it's, essentially, going to be out there before this study is complete and, obviously, it would be retained.

Under the elevated expressway alternative, we could also save large parts of it, but during -- but with all the other

alternatives that are on the table, we would have to tear out sections of it, but that's okay because with overpasses coming in, which all three of these feature, we would actually not need those U-turn facilities because we'd be providing a separate facility. And so next slide, please.

Now, a key question is how will these alternatives do in terms of serving the projected travel demand? Today, if we look at an area south of Encino Rio Road, we're looking at about 90,000 vehicles a day based on existing counts. If we don't do anything else besides superstreets, in the year 2015 -- or 2035, we'd be looking at being able to pump about 115,000 vehicles a day through there.

If we go to the nontolled expressway alternative, we could get up to as much as 210,000 and, obviously, if we add tolls, some of those people aren't going to want to ride on the facilities, so it drops down to 85,000. And then we could get up to 170,000 with both the overpass expansion option and the elevated expressway option. But -- Next slide, please.

If, today, the average speed, whatever that means during the peak hour and, obviously, peak hours can vary, you have an accident, you're going to be lower, so forth. If the average speed is about 25 miles an hour, under the no-build, we would expect that average speed to drop to less than 5 miles an hour. If we got in the overpass expansion, got

rid of the problems at the major intersections, we could see speeds only drop from 25 to 20 miles an hour. If we built the expressway alternatives, on the main lanes, we could see speeds at 45 miles an hour in the year 2035. In between the time that we open any one of these alternatives to the year 2035, we would see -- we would expect higher volumes and as more traffic occurs, we would expect to see those speeds drop. Next slide, please.

One key factor that you need to keep in mind, and

Stephanie will do a much better job talking about this than

I can, is the whole question of access. Under the

expressway alternative, Alternative Number 2, we provide

continuous frontage roads. So all driveways and at

grades -- and cross streets that don't have grade

separation, would be served by those frontage roads. They'd

be captured.

On the elevated option, we have some conflicts remaining where we come up and down with ramps from the existing highway to the elevated sections. Those would have to be worked out. But in between, on the overpass expansion, we're only working at the main intersection. We're grade separating and then we're bringing a ramp, and down here, where we have driveways, we haven't solved that problem. And the potential in the future for someone to say, well, you know, there's not a signal here anymore, why don't we

put a signal in here and create a whole new set of problems?

That is something that is a concern. It has to be worked

out. Next slide, please.

How much right of way would be required under these alternatives? Obviously, there's a fair amount of right of way today. With the overpass expansion, we'd only need about 27 more acres just on the cross streets to get them to connect properly. On the high end, the expressway upgrade would take 124 acres and then there'd be a smaller amount for the other alternatives.

But one thing that we have to keep in mind is what I just finished talking about. We can solve some of these access problems with frontage roads, we could solve some of these problems with backage roads. It will, however, result in these numbers going up depending on how much we use those strategies. Next slide, please.

The Edwards Aquifer is certainly a key issue. People have -- that move out here have to have drinking water. We have to be careful with what we do. And so how much additional right of way would we have to take over the Edwards Aquifer? Well, in the maximum case, the expressway today that we show you out there, we could acquire as much as 85 additional acres. Right behind it, the expansion of both the overpasses and the widening of Blanco and Bulverde would create about 74 and the elevated expressway about 70.

•

The overpass expansion by itself, without solving all of the frontage-road issues, would be as little as nineteen. Next slide.

And impervious cover, which is closely related, that merely says stuff that we want to build out here that won't percolate through, but it'll make the water run off and -- and have drainage problems in other areas. Again, the expressway at 119 acres is the highest, the lowest is the elevated expressway and in between the overpass expansions, but, of course, depending on how much additional frontage roads and backage roads we would be build in the final solution, those numbers could go up some. Next slide.

Homes and businesses. Nobody wants to lose what they've invested in and under the overpass expansion, we'd be looking at 12 commercial structures that would probably have to be taken without considering further improvements. On the expansion of Blanco and Bulverde, we'd be talking about at least 34 additional residential structures and then, of course, on the expressway, we'd be looking at a total of three residential and 28 commercial and slightly less on the elevated section. Next slide, please.

Okay, what we come to you with tonight is recommendation that we carry forward the no-build strictly because we have to carry that forward to provide a comparison to see whether we're doing something better or worse. Carry over the

overpass expansion alternative strictly nontoll, carry over the expressway alternative as nontolled, tolled or managed lanes subject to future decisions by policymakers. And the elevated expressway alternative, nontolled, tolled and managed. And all of them would have these complementary elements included in them, whether it's to add bus service, to improve quality of life with connections with bike and pedestrian facilities and so forth. Next slide.

The only alternative, then, that we're recommending tonight be eliminated is the one that includes both the expansion -- the overpass and expansion of 281 as well as the widening of Blanco and Bulverde Road. The reason we're recommending that is for the following considerations: The Camp Bullis operations impact, the large number of potential displacements of residences and the high potential for vast adverse environmental impacts in terms of additional impact on wildlife habitat, noise impacts on communities and so forth.

With that, I'd like to turn things over to Stephanie and she'll talk to you about the alternatives in greater detail.

MS. STEPHANIE MESSERLI: Hopefully, you've all had a chance, before this meeting, to look at the exhibits we had up on that upper level. We're going to zoom in to a couple key locations and talk about each alternative to give you a little bit more information. And as Michael

mentioned, we have three alternatives, along with the no-build, that are moving forward. It's our recommendation the first alternative is an overpass expansion at 281 and Evans Road. This alternative, like the name says, provides an overpass over the major cross streets and the word expansion means currently what you have are three lanes up to Stone Oak, generally, in each direction and then you have two lanes north of there. So the expansion in this alternative is that we would propose three lanes northbound and southbound north of Stone Oak also. Next slide, please.

SPEAKER: Is that with Bulverde? Is that alternative with Bulverde --

MS. STEPHANIE MESSERLI: That was not Bulverde. We were looking at Evans.

SPEAKER: No, no. I know, but Alternative 1, does that include Bulverde and --

MS. STEPHANIE MESSERLI: It does include Bulverde.

SPEAKER: This is the one that you would want out? The one that they don't want to us recommend, right?

MS. STEPHANIE MESSERLI: Okay. Well,
let's -- let's keep going so we can get done here on time
and we'll have -- Are we going to take questions at the end
or are we gonna keep going? After the discussion. Let's
keep going so we can get through this on time and get to the

small-group discussion.

So that previous drawing we were looking at, this is a planned view drawing of that -- of that same location. So we have Evans Road right here. And to show you what some of the colors mean on the exhibits, there's a light blue color which represents pavement, a darker blue color which represents the bridge and also this green dash line which I think Michael touched on that in his presentation.

The -- the transit has been eliminated from further consideration, but we wanted to provide the opportunity in the future if they did decide they would want a transit component, so -- so that is the provision for that in the future if they would want it.

And the red driveways that are shown on here, these are all the driveways in major -- or minor cross streets. What that indicates is that we need further analysis to determine how we could provide safe access. And what we mean by that, as an example, if you look at HEB, they have two driveways right here in this location. Once you grade separate the intersections, there's no more stoplights for people to stop at, so their speeds would be expected to be much higher on this road.

So if you have through traffic traveling at a higher speed and all of a sudden someone slows down abruptly to make a right turn, it can cause a safety issue. And so we

want to look at all those situations very carefully and make sure we address access.

There's three ways we could provide access. We could provide a frontage road, a backage road or we could purchase access right. So to give just a quick example of what each one of those could be, if we were to provide a frontage road along here, these driveways would act as a frontage road and it — and it wouldn't be a safety concern for us.

An example of a backage road is you have a street through here, it's currently not a public street, it's private street. But if it were upgraded to a public street and these businesses were provided access along the back, that's what we mean when we say a backage road.

What we mean when we say purchasing access rights along here at HEB, if these driveways were not allowed and the access rights were purchased, their access would be provided by a back road. So I don't want to suggest that that's -- that's our recommendation. I'm just giving you an example of what each of those things means. So let's move to the --

SPEAKER: Is somebody who's looking at these studies familiar with the controlled access from parking areas like they do in Florida where they force you back to a -- an intersection that you've got to access? So that -- Actually, you don't have access from, like, the shopping center onto the freeway itself. You've got to go -- Is that

what you consider a backage approach?

you consider a backage approach?

MS. STEPHANIE MESSERLI: The backage approach. Right. And we're not suggesting any certain solution at this point. We're just -- we're showing you the driveways that are in red still need further analysis so we can determine how safe access could be provided. So let's move on to the next location for Alternative 1.

This is at Marshall Road and, once again, you have an overpass over the cross street and it's -- it's a very compressed footprint so -- so that's an advantage of this alternative. With a smaller footprint, comes a less right of way required and a lower impervious cover. So let's look at that in plan view and you have the same colors that represent the same information. A new color you have on here is the heavy orange line and that represents where we would say a proposed right of way would be needed to install this alternative.

So let's move onto Alternative 2 and this is similar to 1 in that it does provide an overpass at the cross street.

This is Evans Evans Road again, but the -- one of the differences is that you have a continuous frontage road on both the northbound and southbound side in this alternative.

One thing you'll notice is that that provides access to all the businesses along there and there's the HEB and the driveways.

q

And in plan view, there's no red, which means, you know, access could be easily or safely provided from the frontage road because you have that in this alternative. With this alternative, though, comes a larger footprint and, you know, more right of way taking, but it also provides a higher level of service and less congestion.

So let's move onto the next location at Marshall.

Similar, again, although we have the frontage roads that run all the way through and a little bit wider footprint. And then let's go to plan view, and this is the same location at Marshall. You'll notice a new symbol on here which is a green dot with a black circle. What that represents is that is a structure that's in conflict with where we would need to purchase right of way. So if this is our proposed right of way, there's some structures that -- that do fall within the proposed right-of-way limits. So that -- that's indicating that.

Okay. So Alternative 3, our last alternative, is the elevated expressway. In this alternative, the new lanes that are built would be elevated and they would be on the outside of the existing lanes south of Stone Oak, north of Stone Oak with a transition to the west side. One of the advantages here is you have the opportunity to save most all of your existing pavement and the new structures are built elevated so you have a very small increase to your existing

impervious cover. With that comes a higher price tag, obviously, because you're building bridge structures for a long distance and here's the plan view and here's yours bridge structures which look, you know, like the previous drawing.

Another thing to point out are these large arrows, a green arrow for Evans, Stone Oak, Marshall. What this indicates is this is where -- if you were on the elevated lanes, you would exit off to go to Evans. So you'd have direct access there.

On this area, you see it says Stone Oak and Marshall. What that's saying is that's the point you'd exit off of the elevated lanes. So that's telling you, if you want to go to Marshall, you're going to have to exit off and sit at a traffic light at Stone Oak to get to Marshall. So although this has some advantages, one of the disadvantages that your access is not quite as good as it would be in other locations. We have limited locations where ramps will fit.

This is an entrance ramp onto this -- This brownish color is an entrance ramp onto the elevated sections. That's what that represents. So let's go to Marshall location and, you know, as we just said, the elevated lanes switch to the west side once you get north of Stone Oak. One of the benefits here is that the superstreets which were installed or being installed would be able to remain in this alternative in the

future.

And let's go to the plan view. And same -- same colors and representations. The -- the light green in here represents superstreets can stay. And in Alternative 3, the superstreets could remain at Marshall and at Stone Oak in the future. And I know I went through that pretty quickly, but I want to keep us on time here. So I think we're done.

MS. LINDA XIMENES: Okay, let me explain how the small-group work process is going to go. You have a number on your agenda. Those numbers were assigned to you just randomly so there's no -- The way this'll work is I'll tell you in a minute what number corresponds to which alternative and then if you'll go and get in that -- with that particular alternative, you'll start with a particular alternative and we'll be the -- the facilitator -- there'll be a facilitator and a scribe in each -- in each group and what you'll do is there'll be four questions that you'll be asked to respond to: What do you like about this alternative, what concerns you about the alternative and then how does it meet the need and purpose and then whether or not you think it's a long-term solution.

You'll have about 20 minutes or so in that small -- in that group with that particular alternative and then we'll ask you to move to the next alternative. So if you start at Alternative 1, you'll move to Alternative 2; if you're at 2,

you'll move to 3; if you're at 3, you'll move to 1 and then we'll do that so you'll have a chance to go to each different alternative. The same questions will be asked in each alternative, so you'll have chance to look at each one in terms of what you like and you don't like, whether you think it meets the need and purpose and how whether or not you think it's got a long-term solution.

What we'd like to do is ask you, as you do that -- let me -- as you're -- as you're working in the small group, just to keep things working smoothly 'cause we don't have a lot of time, is as you're in the group is to listen to understand, to let one person at a time speak, that you would -- that it's okay for you to have -- for there to be different opinions. We're not looking for a consensus in this particular discussion. We're looking for, like, the range of opinions that are here so we can see what the different opinions are that people have about the particular alternative.

Then the last thing is that we ask you to be concise and -- and on target for the -- whatever your comments are.

It's real easy to get sidetracked and that's okay for you to do that for a little bit, but the facilitator will probably ask you to kind of come back to what the question is. Let me --

There are a couple of things. One is that the court

•

 this, we move into the small groups, she'll be setting up again back up on the part of the stairs when we're finished. She'll be there till the meeting is over, so if you have any comments that you want to make to the court reporter, that's fine for you to do that. We're going to move over there and also, if you want to tweet, you can tweet, too. There's lots of ways that you can make your comments.

reporter is right here for now, but after we finish with

What I'm asking you to do is then to look at the number that you have on your sheet, on your agenda. If you'll look on your number -- numbers 1, 2 and 3 are at Alternative 1. You'll start there. We have them set up so that there's one group on this side of the alternative and there are two groups on this other side. So if you'll go -- This is Alternative 1, the one that's the farthest over here. If you'll start there if you have 1, 2 or 3 on your agenda.

If you have 5, 6 or 9. I know this is kind of screwy. Just be patient with us, please. 5, 6 or 9 is Alternative Number 2, which is the one in the middle. It's those where those -- where those long plans are that are like the ones that you just saw. And it's the one in the middle and there -- again, there's two on this side and one on the far side.

And then for groups 4, 7 and 8, you'll start at

Alternative 3, which is the one on the far side. Okay?

It's the one all the way to that end. You'll work in your small groups for about 20 minutes, responding to the questions.

The scribe or -- the scribe will write down the responses on the flip chart so if you see that they're not getting it the way you said or they're not understanding it, make sure that they get it right. And so then you'll have that time.

Then the ones of you that are at this end, which is Alternative 3, will move over to Alternative 1 and you just sit in the same general location that you were and then the ones from 1 will move to 2, the ones from 2 will move to 3. You'll do that twice. You'll move two -- two times after the first session. So you'll go to each different alternative. So you'll have a chance to look -- talk about each alternative and do that. So if you'll go ahead and move over there. Thank you all very much. We'll see you in a minute.

(Small-group work discussions)

Comment 81 SPEAKER: (Richard Hoover) My opinion is that the number 2 would be the best because I like to drive slower and I wouldn't have to drive on the fast lanes. access roads would be ideal for areas where I drive from 306 all the way into town. And we've got a lot of people that are low income in my area and if they made it a toll road, it would be almost impossible because they drive back and forth two or three times a day. An estimated cost of the other meetings we were at was \$10. That would be \$30 per day. That's my opinion. Thank you.

281 and I, too, think the number 2 is the best alternative, but they need to -- right in further of this, as they're building or while they're building this thing, they need to write in there no toll roads and they need to put it in as a law or mandate it, that it's to be a nontolled road area.

Where they fund this, the State's got a lot of money in taxes, free tax money they're getting off of lottery tickets and lottery. They can squeeze out some more money for that, but I think it needs to be mandated that they do not use that new road and try to toll it. 'Cause it's just too much money. It costs too much money for our cars to go back and forth.

Comment 83 SPEAKER: (Russell Seguin) Many concerns about this whole operation, this meeting that we're doing tonight. I have been to meeting after meeting after meeting for years now. Fighting this whole operation for, I guess, at least eight years, possibly nine and when all we need is overpasses.

If the same type of road structure works inside of 1604, why would not the same structure work outside of 1604? If it works in Comal County at 1863 and 281 and 46 and 281 and anywhere else there's overpasses, just put our overpasses in that we have paid for.

We're still being told that the money is not in place to build our overpasses. Then I say our governor and our legislature needs to call for hearings and find out where our money has been squandered and find the money, prosecute those who have squandered the money and build our roads that we have paid for.

We're looking at some drawings here at this meeting of these Cadillac road structures including an elevated system, which I don't understand why we're even considering an elevated road structure when the cost of that would be so astronomical, but yet we're being told that we can't even pay for overpasses. Again, it appears that our tax dollars have been squandered again for the cost of the design, the drawing, the preliminary engineering to draw this elevated

structure. Total waste of my tax dollars.

And if you could also pass on to Mr. Perry that he could be a hero to all of us who live in this area that use 281 everyday, that he could be our hero if he would just tell TxDOT focus on 281, get the overpasses put in. But at this point, myself, my family, my friends, I do not know one person that live out this direction that frequents 281 that is going to vote for Governor Perry this election. Pass that on to him. He could be a hero. But he may end up being a loser this election because he's ticked too many people off and we just can't, in good conscious, vote for him 'cause that would be condoning the way he has squandered this entire operation that we have been fighting him for eight years now.

My last comment is just please stop wasting our tax money and do the right thing. If you can't, leave your office and we'll find someone else who can do the right thing. Thank you.

Comment 84 SPEAKER: (Jorge Garcia) I think that the third plan for proposition would have a negative effect on home values in the area because of the traffic, the noise. The noise would have a negative effect on the local commerce because the cars driving on the ramp, on the elevated ramps, would not have ready access to the local commerce. would bypass it. So that could affect the commercial property values. That's pretty much about it.

Comment 85 SPEAKER: (Deborah M. Wall) I'm going to tie into his. The elevated alternative would negatively affect the residential property value.

MR. TIM SUELTENFUSS: Okay. I'm with

Alternative Number 1. The three most common things people
liked about this alternative are, number one, it's nontoll.

Two, smallest footprint in relation to right of way and
aquifer impact. (unintelligible).

What were the three most common concerns about this alternative? Number one, safety. Specifically, high-speed traffic, conflicting with turning and exiting vehicles; disruption during construction; and it might not completely address congestion and it limits access to businesses during construction.

What were the three most common reasons people stated about how will this alternative will address the needs and purposes of the group? Improve functionality by providing overpasses and, (unintelligible) potentially, it's not as safe as other alternatives and improves quality of life due to absence of tolls.

What were the three most common reasons that they thought this alternative would serve as a long-term solution for U.S. 281? In each, short-term need by eliminating stoplights and could be expanded in the future. Reasons that it would not serve as a long-term solution for U.S. 281, it's not expandable enough for future needs, no continuous running (unintelligible), did not allow for a long-term solution and the common (unintelligible) was that

it was a band-aid and not a long-term solution. Thank you.

MS. LINDA XIMENES: Alternative 2?

MR. JEFF CASBEER: Alternative 2. We had a really good discussion tonight and the things that people most liked about Alternative 2 is the expressway -- elevated expressway with overpasses at the intersections. People liked the frontage roads and the access -- the free access to all the businesses and -- and residency and everything along the corridor. They liked the -- as long as it was nontoll. Let me just say that. As long as it's not tolled, they liked it.

Access was a big thing that it provided adequate capacity for now and in the future. They liked that it was less expensive and the bridge structures -- elevated structures.

And they liked that it also included an opportunity for transit to be added in the future. The biggest concern was that toll road -- they don't want a toll road and it has a larger footprint or there would be more (unintelligible) or the (unintelligible) -- the aquifer.

And then there was -- we had a lot of folks that were interested in transit along the alternative. They wanted to make sure that it was planned to have transit in the future and that we build overpasses to accommodate traffic in the future as long as it was a nontolled road. Everyone pretty much agreed that this met the purpose and the need of the

3?

project as long as it was not a tolled road and they all agreed that it would be a long-term solution as long as it was not a toll road. Thank you.

MS. LINDA XIMENES: Thank you. Alternative

MS. TRICIA BRUCK: Hi. I'm going to talk about Alternative 3, the elevated overpasses. My name's Tricia. When I asked my group what they liked about the alternative, what I heard most was it had less environmental impact than the other alternatives. (Inaudible) functionally preferred the superstreet project and another thing they liked about it was the preservation of the existing lanes on 281.

When I asked my group about what concerned them about Alternative 3, they mentioned the elevated cost, the noise impact and the likelihood to be tolled.

When I asked if they felt this alternative met its need and purpose, they said no, that the toll wouldn't come through. They discussed quality of life. Most people mentioned no because it didn't benefit the through traffic. And we talked about safety. They didn't feel it was as safe as the other options. And we talked about function and functionality. They said no because they felt it had limited access. And when we talked about the last question, if we felt it was a long-term solution for U.S. 281, they

said no and they mainly used the same reasons they entered. Thank you.

MS. LINDA XIMENES: Wrap up.

MS. TERRY BRECHTEL: I'm supposed to remind you about the comment cards. Your comment cards are important. You have ten days to give us comments. May 10th is the day. The last thing I have to say is I am so impressed with the number of people that remained here all the way to 9:00 o'clock on a very, very long day and I think you-all deserve a round of applause. This meeting has been a success and the Spurs are going to be a success, as well, tonight.

MS. LINDA XIMENES: Let me just remind everybody that we will not be having a public meeting until the summer of 2011. The team -- The study team will be looking at these three alternatives during that time. There'll be information posted on the website. We'll be having committee and advisory committee meetings and if you'd like to have a presentation to your homeowners organization or your community organization, let us know so we can make arrangements to do that. Thank you-all very much again for coming.

SPEAKER: Can we copy any of this information and disseminate the information to our neighbors if we have to?

														52
1					MS.	LINDA	ximenes:		Su:	re.	Please, p		lease.	
2	Fil	1	out	a	comment	card,	you	can	also	go	online	and	do	it
3	onl	in	e.											
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
10														
11														
12														
13														
14														
15														
16														
17														
18														
19														
20														
21														
22														
23														
24														
25														
- 1														

C

Comment 86 SPEAKER: (Lloyd Byler) A couple of things that I have not heard discussed, one of them which I think is -- is ludicrous not to evaluate is the impact on tourism. Because I hear tourists go to other cities and other states where they have toll roads, they don't have a toll tag. And so when I'm driving up in Austin or Dallas, I don't take a toll because I don't have a toll tag. And all the stories you hear about getting tagged incorrectly, charged incorrectly, because you don't have a toll tag, there's, obviously, a penalty for doing that and it really, really discourages tourism. And the City of San Antonio depends on tourism. That's our number one industry.

So I don't see why we are discussing toll roads if we have not even considered its impact on tourism. And it's not on any of the literature, it's not on any discussions. I have to bring it up in the meetings.

And, secondly, in any of these evaluation points, they never say cost. They never say a cost as part of the issue and why we're discussing this. I guess it's kind of implied, but why wouldn't there be a question, you know, what about cost? How does this affect the cost? Since money is an issue, since financing these projects is an issue, why shouldn't cost be front and center, then, in consideration this? And each option should have a cost evaluation up front so the people -- the residents, the

community, can decide easier as far as cost goes.

So those are the two main issues. Tourism -- Impact on tourism regarding toll roads and the fact that tourists will not take a toll road because there's a toll tag. It says easy tag only. They can't just go up to the booth and pay for it. And the other one is upfront cost evaluation in these meetings. That's it. Thank you.

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF BEXAR

# COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, PATRICIA M. GREEN, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Texas, hereby certify that I was employed to and did report in shorthand the matter entitled "3RD FUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FOR U.S. 281 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT" on APRIL 29, 2010, and that the foregoing 54 pages of transcription were prepared under my direction and contain and constitute a full, true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes taken at said time and place and reflect, to the best of my skill and ability, an accurate record of the subject proceedings, and that an original and one copy only hereof have been prepared at the direction and for transmission to SONIA JIMENEZ, XIMENES & ASSOCIATES, INC., 421 Sixth Street, #1, San Antonio, Texas 78215.

WITNESS my official hand this the day

2010.

PATRICIA M. GREEN, CSR #3614 Expiration Date: 12/31/10

KOOLE COURT REPORTERS OF TEXAS Firm Registration No. 413 711 Navarro, Suite 101 San Antonio, Texas 78205 (210) 558-9484/FAX 558-3129



**APPENDIX H Small Group Flip Chart Transcription** 



#### Small Group Work Session Overview:

The participants at Public Meeting #3 were randomly divided during registration into small groups of 8 to 10 people and seated near each build alternative. Each group was lead by a facilitator from the US 281 EIS Team. The small group work session participants were asked to discuss a set of four questions:

- **1.** What do you like about this alternative?
- 2. What concerns you about this alternative?
- 3. How well do you think this alternative meets the need and purpose for improvements to US 281?
- 4. How do you think this alternative would, or would not serve as a long-term solution for US 281?

The answers to these questions were captured on flip charts and a transcription of this input is included in tables on the next page.



The groups operated in a round robin fashion. Each group spent about 20 minutes reviewing the build alternative and after 20 minutes, they were asked to rotate to another build alternative and repeat the same exercise. Once everyone had the opportunity to discuss each of the three build alternatives, the groups reconvened as one large group and the facilitator of each group presented a brief report to the whole group on the highlights on their group's discussion. The reporting out to the larger group allowed everyone to hear the various perspectives.

#### Alternative 1 Overpass/Expansion (Non-Toll)

#### Question 1: What do you like about this alternative?

- Non-toll
- Has overpasses
- Lower cost
- Least number of lanes
- Less intrusive
- Least time to build
- · Aesthetics/visually appealing
- Eliminates red lights
- Has option of phased growth
- Leaves room for expansion

- Add frontage roads to shopping centers
- Can use existing federal and state funds
- Least environmental impacts and lower impervious cover
- Allows for future mass transit alternatives and infrastructure
- Similar to US 281 from Loop 410 to downtown
- Least impact on aquifer, Camp Bullis
- Least negative impact to home values and commerce
- Addresses highest congestion areas
- Least amount of change

### Question 2: What concerns you about this alternative?

- · Wilderness Oaks going all the way through
- Congestion on ramps (no frontage road)
- Access problems and cost associated
- Short-term band-aid
- Taking too long to start
- Does not address long-term needs
- May not address the 2035 needs
- Not as good as Alternative 2 and 3
- Re-routing will congest other areas
- How do they let contracts to build this?
- Construction phased in
- No access roads
- Will not improve traffic
- No dedicated exits on frontage roads
- Existing lights intentionally out of sequence
- More disruption than Alternative #3

- Not enough access "helps today, not tomorrow"
- · Least accommodating for future growth
- More disturbance to traffic during construction
- Businesses negatively impacted during construction
- Eliminates the superstreets
- Bridge needed at Mt. Lodge Dr. due to traffic concerns
- Might be obsolete before construction even starts
- More dangerous cross 3 lanes of traffic
- Safety -- speed of traffic and cars merging with through traffic
- Doesn't fully prepare infrastructure for mass transit
- Utility adjustments may make construction longer
- School at Summerglen may require a new traffic light
- No continuous frontage roads
- Distance to change direction

## Question 3: How well does the alternative address the needs and purpose?

- Doesn't address need and purpose
- Fails to address safety and access
- Non-toll = quality of life
- Doesn't address long-term growth
- Improves safety
- Meets all four needs and purpose
- Fails to address growth
- How would it relate to a potential outer loop?
- Considered to be adequate
- Meets need the quickest
- Toll roads discourage tourists

- Does not improve safety because of exits and entrances redirects problems
- Does not improve functionality
- Hurts quality of life due to poor traffic, safety problems, traffic lights
- Extra traffic with turnarounds
- Short-term construction difficulties = short-term nightmare
- Does not alleviate congestion as well as other alternatives
- Less air pollution due to steady flow of traffic

## Question 4: Would this alternative serve as a long term solution?

- · Ramps are dangerous
- Would allow for mass transit infrastructure
- Would reduce travel times
- Affordable
- Short term fix
- No, would serve as a short term band-aid
- No incentives to reduce traffic via carpools
- Would not due to increased development and traffic would not catch up
- Does not address growth
- It is not expandable
- · Length of environmental studies is too long

- Would not and would have to reinvest in 30 years
- Would lower immediate impacts
- It will be obsolete by construction time
- Unneeded alternative
- Would not without continuous frontage roads
- Would meet as it has enough capacity for short-term but could be upgraded
- If Alternative 2 is not tolled, then this alternative is second best.
- Would not due to potential of stopping traffic with future lights
- Would address long-range if you build light rail

#### Alternative 2 Expressway (Non-Toll, Toll, Managed)

#### Question 1: What do you like about this alternative?

- Like this alternative as long as it is non-tolled
- Aesthetically pleasing
- Allows future transit options
- Less expensive
- No superstreets
- Safer access to businesses
- Less expensive to upgrade after 2035
- 45 mph non-stop
- Potential for HOV lanes
- Solves current problem with corridor
- Mirrors US 281 south of Loop 1604
- Efficiency
- Provides choices during peak hours
- Less visual impact than Alternative 3

- Overpasses at major intersections
- Extension of existing expressway
- Adequate capacity
- Has frontage roads
- No lights on main lanes
- Solves access problems free
- Highest capacity and speeds for long term for longer growth
- Improved safety
- Ability for expansion
- Presence of frontage road allows for alternate route if an accident is on the main lanes
- · Limited view of road verses elevated expressway
- Need alternative circulation at certain locations
- Less noise impact than Alternative 3

### Question 2: What concerns you about this alternative?

- Too expensive
- Too many studies
- Cost
- More business impacts
- Is there enough planning now for transit in the future?
- Easy to convert to toll/managed lanes
- Expense to expand after 2035
- Construction timing and sequencing
- Connection to Loop 1604 is important
- Build it fast enough
- Bigger footprint and larger land consumption
- More acreage
- More impact to the aguifer
- More noise impacts than Alternative 1
- Aesthetics of toll stations

- Larger footprint, more impervious cover
- Do not want a toll road
- What happens during construction to mobility?
- Why can't this be funded through non-toll methods?
- · Are we over planning?
- Fewer access points on toll roads, less accessibility
- Needs direct connectors to Loop 1604
- Will it still create a bottleneck at Encino Rio and other intersections?
- Frontage roads too close to neighborhoods
- Would there be a different standard for stormwater in this section than the area south of Loop 1604?
- If this is the preferred alternative, what will the RMA do if those supporting it do not want the toll, have supported it as a non-tolled facility?
- Toll pricing, number of toll stations, distances between toll stations

## Question 3: How well does the alternative address the needs and purpose?

- As long as it can be done without tolls
- It can't get any worse
- Address need and purpose until 2035
- Least impact for everyone
- Environmental impacts are troublesome
- Addresses growth needs
- Less air pollution
- Economic impact
- Quality of life for noise off of US 281
- Greatly improve it

- As long as transit infrastructure is incorporated
- Best decision better safety
- Leaves room for transit in middle and growth
- · Concerns of tourism due to tolls
- Improves the quality of life due to less traffic
- Functions better, if not tolled
- Construction would allow more travel north...see SH 130
- Create a better quality of life and environmental impact
- Meets need better for future growth over Alternative 1
- Improves safety

## Question 4: Would this alternative serve as a long term solution?

- Might not if tolled
- How long for construction?
- Greater capacity and allows for toll
- Highest capacity and speeds and access to property
- Potential environmental impacts meet needs and purposes
- Does not need to have number of lanes and continuous frontage roads
- Most comprehensive solution
- Longest term benefit

- Meets because of design
- Phase to allow multi-step construction
- Goes along existing US 281 and well connected
- · As long as it is not tolled
- Just build it already
- Negative on parallel roads (Bulverde and Blanco) due to tolls
- Provides most number of lanes and moves most traffic
- Construction time would take so long, partially negate long term benefit
- Construction impacts to businesses

#### Alternative 3 Elevated Expressway (Non-Toll, Toll, Managed)

#### Question 1: What do you like about this alternative?

- The environmental impact is less
- The preservation of superstreet
- Nothing
- Less ROW take
- It allows for mass transit in the future
- More environmental friendly to an extent
- Use of existing roads during construction
- Through traffic will benefit
- Concrete is elevated
- Less traffic on a lower level
- Less footprint

- You get more water on the ground because of less pavement/less impervious cover
- More higher speeds can be achieved
- Being able to get on and having to get off
- The wide shoulders
- Benefits of through traffic due to higher speeds
- Traffic on elevated structures will flow faster
- Favorable if going a long distance
- Not disturbing existing roads while building
- It's a nice concept/dream project

## Question 2: What concerns you about this alternative?

- Safety
- Easily tolled
- Less access to businesses
- Least attractive
- · Maintaining stop lights on existing facility
- ROW not used to best of ability
- Still congestion on existing lanes
- High cost
- Inadequate zoning
- · Icing weather conditions
- Driveway access
- Longest construction time
- Does not encourage mass transit

- Devalues commercial and residential property
- More noise
- Ruins aesthetics to area
- Would encourage more development
- If tolled, only rich people would use it
- Limited accessibility
- It doesn't prepare infrastructure for future high capacity
- Increased pollution, more fuel
- Accessibility for emergency vehicles
- Safety of cars falling off
- Higher cost of expansion in the future
- Concerned about displaced animals in yards
  - Less direct access

### Question 3: How well does the alternative address the need and purpose?

- Not with respect to safety
- It does meet need and purpose
- · Would not meet, if tolled
- No, it does not address growth pending approval of development plan (City of San Antonio)
- Is it really viable?
- Businesses would not want to be here
- Improvement to what is existing
- Emergency Management Services safety issues
- Not sitting in traffic will increase quality of life
- It is overkill
- Less access to business from main lanes
- Lower housing prices
- Ramps pose a traffic issue due to speed

- It benefits through traffic but not local traffic
- Funeral home would need to be torn down
- If tolled, will address but it not as well if not tolled
- Possibility of tolling impacting tourism
- Limited access to elevated structure from neighborhood roads
- Expandable, but extremely expensive
- Does not meet quality of life because it affects businesses
- Will meet immediate need but not growth because there's no room for expansion (availability of adding lanes is reduced)
- Reduced noise will increase quality of life
- Need 2-lane exit to US 281 south and 1-lane exit to Loop 1604
- Potential congestion at ramps because they are only 1-lane
- With non-compete toll, other roads not expanded
- Local residents are paying tolls, thus higher cost of living

#### Question 4: Would this alternative serve as a long term solution?

- · Keeps fueling sprawl
- Would not property values would decrease and there would be impacts to businesses
- Would not expansion would be more expensive than other alternative
- Traffic will flow better
- Not sure

- Would not additional lanes would just re-direct traffic
- Would not maintenance is impracticable and very
- It is industrialized looking, not aesthetically pleasing
- Will not use it to the full extent possible, if tolled
- Would but concerned about impact to local residences
- Live on Loop 410